


3 1761 11767208 9



CA1  
L21  
-67W56







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761117672089>





CA1621

67W56

Government  
Publications

19

Stanislaw Judek

[ General publications ]

WOMEN IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE  
their utilization  
and employment



Economics and Research Branch  
CANADA DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR





Stanislaw Judek

# WOMEN IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

© Crown Copyrights reserved  
Available by mail from the Queen's Printer, Ottawa,  
and at the following Canadian Government bookshops:

HALIFAX  
1735 Barrington Street

MONTREAL  
Æterna-Vie Building, 1182 St. Catherine Street West

OTTAWA  
Daly Building, Corner Mackenzie and Rideau

TORONTO  
221 Yonge Street

WINNIPEG  
Mall Center Building, 499 Portage Avenue

VANCOUVER  
657 Granville Street

or through your bookseller

Price \$2.00 Catalogue No. L38-2568

Price subject to change without notice


ROGER DUHAMEL, F.R.S.C.  
Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery  
Ottawa, Canada  
1968



## FOREWORD

In the Fall of 1965, the Canada Department of Labour convened an interdepartmental committee to explore the conduct of a study of the employment and utilization of women in the federal government service. Dr. Stanislaw Judek, Professor of Economics, University of Ottawa, was asked to undertake it as an independent inquiry, financed under contract with the Department of Labour.

Dr. Judek consulted the interdepartmental committee from time to time and received technical assistance from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the Public Service Commission and the Economics and Research Branch of our Department. He assumed full responsibility for developing and carrying out the study and for the analyses, interpretations and recommendations in his report. We are indebted to Dr. Judek for the enthusiasm and unflagging energy with which he undertook this work.



Gil Schonning,  
Director-General,  
Research and Development,  
Canada Department of Labour.

December 1967.





## PREFACE

The Royal Commission on Government Organization in its 1962 Report suggested that the policy of equality of treatment for women, implicit in the Public Service Employment Act, is not fully implemented in practice. This study provides factual information on many aspects of the relative utilization of male and female public employees in the federal public service of Canada. The historical and current statistical information is based primarily on publications by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Public Finance and Transportation Division, Government Employment and Payrolls Section and on the Survey of Utilization of Employees in the Public Service of Canada, conducted in 1967 by the Canada Department of Labour in the Ottawa-Hull metropolitan area.

The employment policy and practices of the federal government of Canada merit particular attention because the government is the nation's largest employer. Moreover, one expects the federal government to provide leadership in enlightened, progressive and non-discriminatory employment policies and practices — a leadership that should be followed by provincial and local governments and by private employers.

A number of recommendations consistent with the findings of this study are offered in the hope that they will provide guidelines for the personnel policy-makers of the federal government and for other employers of female labour.

Since this study is among the pioneering works in this field in Canada it is, naturally, subject to various limitations of a statistical and analytical nature. It is apparent that more extensive and continuous research is required, and statistical data on public employees should be geared toward the principal objectives of such research. Studies should be initiated immediately to review how women are employed under the Public Service Employment Act, and how they are employed in the public sector not covered by the Act. A comparative study of the federal government as an employer with industry and business employers should be undertaken, and also comparative international studies. About one third of the Canadian labour force is women, and women have their own social, psychological, legal and political problems. This alone justifies the continuous attention of public policy-makers, employers and scholars.

This research project has been prepared as an independent study for the Canada Department of Labour but, as such, has leaned heavily on the co-operation of officials of numerous federal government departments and agencies. In most cases this co-operation was readily forthcoming. I was also constructively assisted by an advisory committee composed of senior officials of the Department of Labour and its Women's Bureau, the Department of Manpower and Immigration, and the Public Service Commission.

I wish to acknowledge particularly the assistance and valuable suggestions offered by Dr. Gil Schonning, formerly Director-General of Research and Development, Department of Labour, and Mr. David Fairbairns, of the Economics and Research Branch of the Department. Special thanks are due to Mrs. E. Sufrin, Canada Department of Labour, for competently supervising the survey and for useful criticism and very constructive suggestions while the manuscript was being prepared. I also wish to thank Mr. Denis Myette, a postgraduate student of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa, and Mr. Alan Portigal, Canada Department of Labour, for assistance in preparation of Chapter 11 of this study.

It should be stated, however, that the interpretation of factual information and the recommendations are my own responsibility, and do not necessarily reflect Departmental thinking or policies.

University of Ottawa  
December, 1967.

Stanislaw Judek, Ph.D.,  
Professor of Economics





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	xvii
CHAPTER I — THE FEMALE WORK FORCE TODAY . . . . .	1
1. Women in the Canadian Labour Force, 1966. . . . .	1
2. Development of Womanpower and Some Social and Economic Issues . . . . .	2
CHAPTER II — GROWTH AND COMPOSITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT . . . . .	7
1. Historical Review . . . . .	7
a. Growth of Federal Employment, 1912-1966 . . . . .	7
b. Women's Changing Position in the Federal Service . . . . .	9
2. Women in Canada's Federal Undertakings and Public Service in 1966 . . . . .	12
a. Type of Engagement . . . . .	12
b. Employment by Department and Agency . . . . .	13
c. Classification by Function . . . . .	18
3. Geographic Location . . . . .	18
a. Provincial Distribution . . . . .	18
b. Metropolitan Area Concentration . . . . .	18
4. Age Distribution . . . . .	22
5. Occupational Composition . . . . .	23
a. Broad Occupational Distribution . . . . .	23
b. Predominantly Female Occupations . . . . .	25
c. Occupations with a Minority of Women . . . . .	26
6. Grades and Salaries . . . . .	26
a. Grades Distribution in 1966. . . . .	30
b. Salary Group. . . . .	30
CHAPTER III — PROMOTION, TRAINING AND EARNINGS . . . . .	33
1. Promotion . . . . .	33
a. Recent Promotion . . . . .	34
b. Assessment of Promotion Prospects . . . . .	36
c. Career Expectations . . . . .	37
d. Entrance into Different Line of Work . . . . .	38
e. Supervisory Positions . . . . .	38
f. Preferences for a Woman in Various Working Relationships . . . . .	41
2. Training . . . . .	43
a. Training by the Public Service Commission . . . . .	44
b. Educational Leave . . . . .	45
c. Survey's Data on Training . . . . .	45
3. Median Salaries of Male and Female Public Employees in 1966 . . . . .	45
a. Median Salaries by Occupational Group. . . . .	49
b. Ratios of Female-Male Median Salaries . . . . .	53

	Page
CHAPTER IV – REGULARITY OF EMPLOYMENT	54
1. Absence from Work	54
a. Sick Leave	54
b. Special Leave	58
2. Part-time Employment	60
a. Advantages and Disadvantages	60
b. Female Public Employees' Preferences Regarding the Length of a Working Day	62
3. Mobility of Employees Within the Federal Service	63
4. Separations from the Public Service	65
a. Turnover Rates	65
b. Frequency of Separation	67
c. Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service	69
d. Assessment of Earnings and Fringe Benefits Outside the Federal Service by Those Leaving	70
e. Withdrawal from the Labour Market	72
CHAPTER V – SOME CHARACTERISTICS AND PROBLEMS OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES	74
1. Some Characteristics of the Female Public Employees	74
a. Marital Status and Occupational Distribution	74
b. Marital Status and Age Group	74
c. Family Responsibilities	74
d. Husband's Income in 1966	78
2. Comments on Federal Service Employment	78
a. Community Child Care Facilities	80
b. Promotional Opportunities	80
c. On-the-job Health Care Provisions	81
d. Superannuation Policies	83
e. Maternity Leave Provisions	83
3. Overtime Work	85
a. Extent of Overtime Work Per Month	86
b. Desired Extent of Overtime Work Per Month	87
4. Travelling on Official Business	88
a. Rejection of a Position Demanding Travelling	88
b. Attitudes Towards Extent of Travelling	90
CHAPTER VI – SOURCES OF RECRUITEMENT	91
1. Previous Work Experience	91
a. Former Employer	91
b. Relationship Between Last Occupation and Present Position	91
2. Immigrant Public Employees	93
3. Recruitment of University Graduates	95

	Page
CHAPTER VII – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	98
A. Growth and Composition of Public Service Employment. . . . .	98
B. Promotion, Training and Earnings . . . . .	99
C. Regularity of Employment . . . . .	101
D. Some Characteristics and Problems of Female Public Employees . . . . .	102
E. Sources of Recruitment . . . . .	103
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	105
APPENDICES . . . . .	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	141



## LIST OF TABLES

### CHAPTER II

	Page
2-1 Growth of Federal Departmental Employment, 1912-1966 . . . . .	8
2-2 Appointments to Permanent and Temporary Positions Under the Civil Service Act, 1920-1965 . . . . .	10
2-3 Employment in the Federal Public Service, by Type of Engagement and Sex, September 1966 . . . . .	13
2-4 Employment in the Federal Public Service, by Department Agency and Sex, September 1966 . . . . .	14
2-5 Public Employees in Departments and Departmental Corporations, by Function and Sex, September 1966 . . . . .	19
2-6 Full-time Employees Under the Civil Service Act, by Province and Sex, September 1960 and 1966. . . . .	21
2-7 Distribution of Full-time Employees Under the Civil Service Act, by Metropolitan Area, and Sex, September 1966 . . . . .	21
2-8 Age Distribution of Full-time Civil Service Employees, by Sex, September 1966. . . . .	22
2-9 Full-time Employees Under the Civil Service Act, by Class Group and Sex, September 1960 and 1966 . . . . .	24
2-10 Predominantly Female Occupations, Full-time Employees Under the Civil Service Act, September 1966 . . . . .	25
2-11 Predominantly Male Occupations, Full-time Employees Under the Civil Service Act, September 1966 . . . . .	27
2-12 Average Grade by Sex, Selected Occupations, September 1966 . . . . .	30
2-13 Full-time Service Employees, by Salary Group and Sex, September 1960 and 1966 . . . . .	31

### CHAPTER III

3-1 Percentage of Public Employees Promoted Within Past Two Years, by Occupation and Sex . . . . .	34
3-2 Percentage of Public Employees Promoted Within Past Two Years, by Current Salary Level and Sex . . . . .	35
3-3 Length of Time in Present Grade, by Sex . . . . .	35
3-4 Public Employees' Self-Assessed Promotion Prospects, by Sex . . . . .	36
3-5 Public Employees' Assessment of Reasons for Poor or Very Poor Promotion Prospects, by Sex . . . . .	36
3-6 Grade Public Employees Think They Should Have Achieved, by Sex. . . . .	37
3-7 Grade Public Employees Expect to Achieve in Next Ten Years, by Sex . . . . .	38
3-8 Distribution of Public Employees Who Wish to Enter Different Line of Work in the Federal Service, by Sex and Occupation . . . . .	39
3-9 Percentage of Those Holding Supervisory Positions in the Federal Service by Years of Work in and out of the Federal Service, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	40
3-10 Percentage of Those Holding Supervisory Positions in the Federal Service by Level of Education, Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	40

	Page
3-11 Public Employees' Assessment of Performance of Men and Women in Supervisory and Non-Supervisory Positions, by Sex . . . . .	41
3-12 Preferences for Male or Female Supervisor, Assistant or Co-Worker as Related to Experience, by Sex . . . . .	42
3-13 Enrolment in Public Administration and Management Improvement Training Programs Organized by the Civil Service Commission, by Sex, 1960/61 to 1965/66 . . . . .	44
3-14 Percentage Participating in Government Operated and Supported Training Programs for Public Employees, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	46
3-15 Extent of Government Operated and Supported Training Programs for Public Employees, by Sex and Years of Work in and out of the Federal Service . . . . .	47
3-16 Extent of Government Operated and Supported Training Programs for Female Public Employees, by Marital Status . . . . .	48
3-17 Median Salaries of Public Employees, by Occupational Group, Level of Education, Years of Work in and out of the Federal Service of Canada, and Sex . . . . .	50
3-18 Median Salaries of Male and Female Public Employees, by Level of Education and Years of Work in and out of the Federal Service of Canada. . . . .	52
3-19 Ratios of Female-Male Public Employees' Median Salaries, by Level of Education and Years of Work in and out of the Federal Service . . . . .	53

#### CHAPTER IV

4-1 Number of Days on Casual and/or Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	55
4-2 Number of Days on Casual and/or Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Marital Status and Sex . . . . .	55
4-3 Number of Days on Casual and/or Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Sex and Age Group. . . . .	57
4-4 Frequency of Absence Due to Casual and/or Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Sex and Occupational Group . . . . .	57
4-5 Frequency of Absence Due to Casual and/or Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Marital Status and Sex . . . . .	59
4-6 Frequency of Absence Due to Casual and/or Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Age Group and Sex . . . . .	59
4-7 Number of Days on Special Leave in 1966, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	61
4-8 Number of Days on Special Leave in 1966, by Marital Status and Sex . . . . .	61
4-9 Special Leave in 1966 of Married Female Public Employees, by Number of Children . . . . .	62
4-10 Female Public Employees' Preferences Regarding Length of Working Day, by Occupational Group . . . . .	63
4-11 Female Public Employees' Preferences Regarding Length of Working Day, by Level of Earnings . . . . .	64
4-12 Female Public Employees' Preferred Length of Working Day, by Marital Status . . . . .	64
4-13 Married Female Public Employees' Preferred Length of Working Day, By Number of Children . . . . .	64
4-14 Number of Departments or Agencies Worked for, by Years of Work in the Federal Service, Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	66

	Page
4-15	Turnover Rates of Employees in the Public Service of Canada, 1962 to 1965, by Sex . . . 67
4-16	Frequency of Separation from the Federal Service, by Years of Work in the Federal Service, Marital Status, Occupational Group and Sex . . . . . 68
4-17	Primary Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service, by Age Group and Sex . . . . . 69
4-18	Primary Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service by Marital Status and Sex . . . . . 70
4-19	Primary Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service, by Sex and Occupational Group . . . . . 71
4-20	Assessment of Earnings Outside Federal Employment by Those Leaving for Another Employer, by Sex and Occupational Group . . . . . 71
4-21	Assessment of Fringe Benefits Outside Federal Employment by Those Leaving, by Sex and New Employer. . . . . 72
4-22	Destination of Those Leaving the Federal Service, by Sex, Occupational Group and New Employer . . . . . 72
4-23	Reasons for Withdrawal from the Labour Market, by Sex and Age Group . . . . . 73

## CHAPTER V

5-1	Occupational Group and Marital Status of Female Public Employees . . . . . 75
5-2	Age and Marital Status of Female Public Employees . . . . . 75
5-3	Female Public Employees by Marital Status and Number of Children . . . . . 75
5-4	Married Female Public Employees, by Age Group and Number of Children . . . . . 76
5-5	Female Public Employees, by Marital Status and the Number and Age Group of Children . . . . . 77
5-6	Level of Earnings and Number of Supported Children of Married Female Public Employees . . . . . 77
5-7	Level of Education and Number of Children of Married Female Public Employees . . . . . 78
5-8	Married Female Public Employees and Husband's Income in 1966 . . . . . 79
5-9	Married Female Public Employees, by Husband's Income in 1966 and Number of Children . . . . . 79
5-10	Overtime Work of Female Public Employees, by Occupational Group . . . . . 86
5-11	Overtime Work of Female Public Employees, by Marital Status . . . . . 86
5-12	Overtime Work of Female Public Employees, by Age Group . . . . . 87
5-13	Female Public Employees' Views on Desired Extent of Overtime Work Related to Personal Experience of Overtime Work. . . . . 87
5-14	Female Public Employees' Views on Desired Extent of Overtime Work, by Marital Status . . . . . 88
5-15	Percentage Who Would Reject Position Necessitating Travelling on Official Business, by Sex, Age Group and Marital Status . . . . . 89

## CHAPTER VI

6-1	Category of Last Employer and Years of Previous Work Experience of Public Employees, by Occupational Group and Sex. . . . . 92
6-2	Percentage of Public Employees Whose Occupation with Last Employer Was Related to Federal Service, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . . 93
6-3	Foreign-born Public Employees, by Sex and Time of Arrival in Canada. . . . . 93



	Page
6-4 Percentage of Foreign-born to Total Public Employees, by Occupational Group and Sex . .	94
6-5 Foreign-born and Canadian-born Public Employees, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	94
6-6 Canadian- and Foreign-born Public Employees, by Sex and Level of Education . . . . .	95
6-7 Recruitment of University Graduates 1961/62 and 1962/63 Junior Executive Officers and Foreign Officers . . . . .	96
6-8 Applications and Eligible List of University Graduates, by Occupational Class and Sex, 1964 and 1965. . . . .	97

## LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
A. Stratification by Occupation and Sex with Sampling Ratios by Major Occupational Grouping . . . . .	109
B. Sample of Covering Letter . . . . .	111
C. Sample of the Questionnaire in Survey of Utilization of Employees in the Public Service of Canada, 1967. . . . .	112
CHAPTER II	
2-1 Employment in the Federal Public Service, by Type of Engagement, Province and Sex, September 1966 . . . . .	118
2-2 Distribution of Selected Occupations, by Sex and Grade, Full-time Employees under the Civil Service Act, September 1966 . . . . .	119
CHAPTER III	
3-1 Percentage of Public Employees' Promoted Within Past Two Years, by Occupational Group, Sex, and Current Salary Level . . . . .	122
3-2 Length of Time in Present Grade, by Occupation and Sex . . . . .	123
3-3 Self-Assessed Promotion Prospects, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	124
3-4 Self-Assessment of Reasons for Poor or Very Poor Promotion Prospects, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	125
3-5 Self-Assessment of Grade Capability , by Occupation and Sex . . . . .	126
3-6 Career Level Expectations in the Next Ten Years, by Occupation and Sex. . . . .	127
3-7 Assessment of Performance of Men and Women in Supervisory and Non-Supervisory Positions, by Sex and Occupational Group . . . . .	128
3-8 Preferences for Male or Female Supervisor as Related to Experience of Working Under a Woman Supervisor, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	129
3-9 Preferences for Male or Female Assistant Related to Experience of Working with Woman Assistant by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	130
3-10 Preferences for Male or Female Co-Worker Related to Experience of Working with Woman Co-worker, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	131
CHAPTER IV	
4-1 Number of Days on Casual Sick Leave in 1966, by Occupational Group and Sex . . . . .	132
4-2 Number of Days on Casual Sick Leave in 1966, by Marital Status and Sex . . . . .	132
4-3 Number of Days on Casual Sick Leave in 1966, by Sex and Age Group . . . . .	133
4-4 Number of Days on Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Occupational Group and Sex. . . . .	134
4-5 Number of Days on Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Marital Status and Sex. . . . .	134
4-6 Number of Days on Certified Sick Leave in 1966, by Age Group and Sex. . . . .	135
4-7 Separations, Civil Service of Canada, by Reason and Sex, Calendar Years 1962 to 1965 . .	135
4-8 Turnover Rates of Selected Occupations, by Sex, Employees Under the Civil Service Act, 1965 . . . . .	136
4-9 Turnover Rates of Professional Occupations, by Sex, Employees Under the Civil Service Act, 1965 . . . . .	137

## CHAPTER V

5-1	Number of Comments by Female Employees on Some Aspects of Employment in the Federal Service, by Nature of Problem and Marital Status . . . . .	138
5-2	Attitudes of Public Employees Toward Extent of Travelling on Official Business, by Age Group, Sex, and Marital Status. . . . .	139





## INTRODUCTION

The Royal Commission on Government Organization in its 1962 Report made the following observations with respect to employment and utilization of women in the public service of Canada:

"The policy of equality of treatment for women, which is implicit in the Civil Service Act, is not fully implemented in practice."<sup>1</sup>

"Officially, there is no discrimination between male and female applicants for public service employment (but) subtle differences do, however, appear in practice . . . the pay discrimination against women existing in the private sector tends to be reflected in the public service."<sup>2</sup>

The Commission also suggested that discrimination exists in "training opportunities" and in appointments to "senior levels of management." It criticized the government for not making "more effective use of the talents and qualifications of women."

These observations prompted the Canada Department of Labour to initiate this study early in 1966 under the Skilled Manpower Training Research Program. The government's interest in womanpower has been spurred by an increasing need for high-quality personnel, regardless of sex.

The principal objectives of this study are as follows:

- to provide statistical information and analytical background on the changing patterns in women's employment in the public service, historically and currently;
- to indicate principal characteristics of female public employees in terms of age, experience, marital status, family responsibilities, regularity of employment (separation, turnover and absence) and, in some instances, compare them with those of male employees;
- to determine how the careers of men and women progress or are related to such variables as length of service, education and occupation, and to indicate the differences observed;
- to assess career expectations of both men and women; and to examine personnel policies and practices that may facilitate or impede the employment of women in the public service, including policies and practices related to working conditions, social security, training, part-time work, travelling on official business, etc.;
- to determine the expressed attitudes and preferences of men and women toward women in various working relationship;
- to give some indications of how the government compares with other employers in utilization of womanpower; and
- to recommend personnel policies and practices within the public service in order to make more effective use of the capacities and skills of female public employees.

**Methodology** — The methodology used in this study includes historical, statistical and analytical approaches. The composition of changing patterns in women's employment in government service will be treated in the context of historical developments in legislation and social attitudes over several decades. A statistical approach implies a presentation of statistical evidence obtained, whenever possible, from official government sources. A major source for this study was the special "Survey of Utilization of Employees in

---

<sup>1</sup>The Royal Commission on Government Organization, "Management of the Public Service," Col. 1 (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962), p. 275. The Civil Service Act, Ch. 57, 1960-61 Statutes was replaced in March 1967 by the Public Service Employment Act, Ch. 71, 1966-67 Statutes.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 379.

the Public Service of Canada, 1967" conducted by the Canada Department of Labour. The theoretical analysis will attempt to explain the various differentials in employment and utilization of men and women and to provide a factual basis for recommendations as to future personnel policies and practices in the public sector of employment.

Two things should be mentioned here. In March 1967 the Civil Service became, through Act of Parliament, the Public Service and the Civil Service Commission became the Public Service Commission. In this study the two designations are used synonymously. Secondly, references are made to employees who are covered by the Civil Service Act; broadly speaking, employees of the federal government paid at pre-vailing, or local, rates are not covered by the Act, nor are personnel in crown agencies, the Armed Services and certain regulatory boards.

**Selection of Survey Sample** — The special survey was in the form of a questionnaire sent to full-time federal employees under the Civil Service Act in the Ottawa-Hull metropolitan area. As of September 1966 this area accounted for 23.4 per cent of the total number of 105,353 male employees, and for 38.1 per cent of the total number of 39,828 female employees. There were two principal reasons for restricting the coverage to employees in the Ottawa-Hull area: uniformity in working environment of men and women, and ease in conducting and completing the survey within the scheduled time limits because close liaison by direct contact with the departments involved would be possible. It was also felt that the area would be representative of the federal public service as a whole.

Valuable assistance and co-operation were received in developing the size and type of the sample of public employees to be used in the survey from the Sampling and Survey Research Division of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the Planning and Research Service of the Civil Service Commission and the Economics and Research Branch of the Department of Labour.

It was decided that the sample would be stratified by occupation and sex. Those occupations were chosen in which both men and women are employed. Hence, the service and maintenance occupations, predominantly male, were excluded. It was necessary to estimate the numbers employed in the Ottawa-Hull area by occupation. From this statistical universe the appropriate numbers of men and women were required to produce a representative occupational sample.

The various occupations, within broad groups of professional, administrative, technical and inspection, postal, customs and immigration, and clerical employees, were stratified in 29 groups.<sup>3</sup> These are shown in Appendix A. A scientific sample of men in these 29 occupational strata, and of women in certain clerical strata was taken on the basis of sampling ratios which are shown also in this appendix. In most occupational strata the number of women was relatively small so all female employees were included.

The Civil Service Commission made computer tapes of employee records and classification data available to the Data Liaison Section of the Economics and Research Branch of the Department of Labour, revised to January 1, 1967, and from these a sample and mailing list was compiled. The mailing list labels gave the employee's name, department or agency, occupational stratum and sex.<sup>4</sup>

Using the sampling techniques described above, a sample of 3,524 males and 2,127 females, or a total of 5,651 federal employees in the Ottawa-Hull area was selected for the survey. In the Postal, Customs and Immigration occupational group only a few women were represented and, consequently, in some tables this category is omitted.

<sup>3</sup>The occupational classification and stratification used in this study is that which existed prior to the new classification program initiated in 1965.

<sup>4</sup>Some discrepancies existed in the Civil Service Commission's employee data records as between recorded and actual number of employees in the occupations selected. They were due to a time lag in transmitting employee data changes from departments to the Commission, changes in employee status which occurred between January 1 and March 24, 1967, the date on which the final mailing list for the survey was produced and, finally, they were due to the reclassification of positions in the federal service which was in progress but not completed during the period when the survey was undertaken.

**Mailing Procedures** — The survey mailing was expedited with the assistance of the Taxation Distribution Division of the Department of National Revenue in machine-labelling correspondence, and by the Special Services Branch of the Department of Labour in preparing the mailings for distribution to the 46 departments or agencies where employees in the survey were located.

Strict anonymity as to the identification of the questionnaire was promised and indeed maintained, and the respondents were not required to sign it. To provide a check of the occupation survey stratum involved, as indicated by the respondent, the questionnaire was coded with the same stratum and sex code shown on the mailing address. All replies were edited to eliminate discrepancies between the initial coding and actual occupations indicated by respondents.

Prior to commencement of the survey, the chief personnel officers in the departments had been advised of the purpose of the survey, and their co-operation solicited in distribution to employees of the questionnaire with a covering letter as well as a two-step follow-up procedure. The covering letter is attached as Appendix B. Excellent co-operation was received from all concerned.

**Response Rate** — Personnel officers had been asked to return questionnaires which could not be delivered to an employee because he or she had left the service, had been transferred out of the capital area, was on an extended leave without pay, or for other reasons. Such returns amounted to about 12 per cent of the initial sample. The largest number involved Foreign Service Officers. The sample was accordingly adjusted to reflect actual questionnaires delivered and to eliminate a small number of replies (28) received from employees who proved to be in occupations or agencies not covered by the survey.

The net sample after adjustment comprised 3,108 males and 1,881 females or a total of 4,989 employees. Documents returned and processed for use in this study came from 2,783 males and 1,616 females, totalling 4,399 and giving an overall response rate of 88.2 per cent.

The response rates by sex and broad occupational groups are indicated in the table below.

**RESPONSE RATES OF THE SURVEY ON UTILIZATION OF EMPLOYEES  
IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA, 1967,  
BY SEX AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUP**

Occupational Group	Response Rates by Sex	
	Males %	Females %
Professional . . . . .	89.0	86.2
Administration A, B and C . . . . .	92.8	86.6
Technical and Inspection . . . . .	93.8	89.7
Postal, Customs and Immigration . . . . .	85.4	72.7*
Clerical . . . . .	82.3	84.0
All groups . . . . .	89.5	85.9

\*Eight replies from 11 in sample.

To adjust the sample to the total according to employee records from which the sample was taken the sampling ratio applied in each occupational stratum was used as a multiplier or "blow-up" factor in the particular stratum, and these upward revised figures are reflected in the tabulations used in this study. Not all respondents replied to all questions and, consequently, the effective response rate for various sections of the statistical analysis was reduced accordingly.

Tabulation of the data was produced with the co-operation of the Data Processing Division of the Canada Department of Labour and the Central Data Processing Bureau of the Treasury Board.

A sample questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix C. (This questionnaire was circulated also in French). It is divided into two parts, Part A, containing questions 1 to 38 inclusive, was to be completed by both men and women, while Part B, containing questions 39 to 44 inclusive, was to be completed by female employees only.

Chapter I discusses briefly the Canadian female labour force in 1966 and the significance of the development of womanpower and the social economic issues it involves.

Chapter II presents factual information on and an analysis of the historical growth and composition of the federal civil service, with special emphasis on the role of women, past and present, in the public sector of employment.

Chapter III is concerned with the relative advancement, training and earnings of male and female public employees. It also includes an analysis of promotion prospects, distribution of supervisory positions and employees' expressed preferences, based on actual experience, toward a woman in a number of working relationships such as supervisor, assistant or co-worker.

Chapter IV is limited to regularity of employment of both men and women in the federal service. In particular, it examines rates of absence for both sexes, women employees' views on part-time employment, mobility of employees within, and separation from, the federal service with reasons for such separation, and finally, reasons for withdrawal from the labour market altogether.

Chapter V is devoted almost entirely to characteristics and special problems of the female public employees. Special consideration is given to married women and the extent of their family responsibilities. This is followed by a summary of comments made by women on some aspects of employment in the federal service such as maternity leave provisions, on-the-job health facilities and services, etc. Finally, overtime work and travelling on official business are discussed and women's views on these subjects are examined.

Chapter VI considers the sources of recruitment of civil servants, their occupational backgrounds and how this relates to their present positions in the public service. A brief examination of immigrant government employees is made to assess their contribution to the public service in Canada. A last section in this chapter deals with recruitment of university graduates into the public service.

Chapter VII contains a summary of findings and a list of recommendations.



## CHAPTER I

### THE FEMALE WORK FORCE TODAY

This chapter begins with a brief review of the female sector of the Canadian labour force today. This is followed by a discussion of the economic and social significance of women as a labour source and of the social issues involved in their dual roles as workers and as wives and mothers.

#### 1. Women in the Canadian Labour Force, 1966

A significant change has been taking place in the composition of the Canadian labour force, particularly since World War II, owing to the influx of women workers. The total work force has grown from 1.8 million in 1901 to 6.5 million in 1961,<sup>1</sup> an increase of almost 260 per cent compared with an increase of 240 per cent in the general population of Canada during the same period. Over the whole period 1901-61, the male labour force tripled from 1.5 to 4.7 million and the female work force increased seven times from over 200,000 to 1.8 million. Consequently, the share of women in the total labour force more than doubled, from about 13 per cent in 1901 to almost 28 per cent in 1961. The number of women in the labour force and in employment passed the two-million mark in 1965 and in the following year it amounted to 2.2 million, which represented approximately 30 per cent of the total labour force of 7.4 million.<sup>2</sup>

While the overall male labour force participation rate<sup>3</sup> has been steadily declining, particularly since the end of the Second World War, from 85.1 per cent in 1946 to 77.8 per cent in 1966, the labour force participation rate for women has been constantly increasing, from 24.7 per cent in 1946 to 32.8 per cent in 1966.

Between 1961 and 1966, the percentage increase in employment in Canada of 18.1 per cent outstripped the increase of 11.8 per cent in population growth. But the increase of women in employment was 29.6 per cent, more than double the rate of increase — 12.1 per cent — in the female population. By contrast, during this five-year period the male population grew by 11.5 per cent and male employment by 13.7 per cent. Numerically, during this period about 600,000 men and 500,000 women were added to the employed population.

Another striking fact is the substantial increase both in the number of married women who are working and in their labour force participation rate. The latter rose from 20.8 per cent in 1961 to 26.8 per cent in 1966. Thus, more than one out of four married women is in the work force. This is a dramatic change from the early 1950's, when only one out of ten was in the labour force. The persistence of high and steadily increasing labour force participation rates of married women is evidence of the strength of the longer-run economic forces and not just wartime emergency. The rate for single women dropped from 51.4 per cent in 1961 to 49.7 in 1966, mainly as a result of high school attendance. Of the 495,000 women added to the female employed population between these two years, more than twice as many, 338,000, were married women compared to single or other self-supporting women (widowed, separated or divorced). In 1966 married women represented 52.5 per cent of working women. This achievement by married women of first rank in the percentage distribution has come about since the beginning of this decade; prior to 1960, single women held the larger share in the female work force and in employment. The limit to the relative possible increase in employment of single women has very likely been reached as school attendance is being prolonged and as women marry younger.

<sup>1</sup>Census data: The Dominion Bureau of Statistics carries out a national census every ten years and, periodically since 1945, conducts labour force sample surveys for intercensal years.

<sup>2</sup>Canada Department of Labour, Women's Bureau, *Facts and Figures about Women in the Labour Force, 1966* (Ottawa, 1967), p. 14. The statistical data are based on sample surveys of the Special Surveys Division, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

<sup>3</sup>The labour force participation rate is defined as the percentage of the population of working age (14 years and over) that is in the labour force.

Whereas the marital status of women in the labour force has shown a marked change between 1961 and 1966, there has been very little fluctuation in the age distribution of the female work force. In 1966 almost half the women in the labour force were 35 years of age and over, and one in five was in the 35-44 age bracket, while almost equal percentages, 17.7 and 17.5, were in the 25-34 and 45-54 age groups respectively. The latter age bracket accounted for one-fifth of the total addition to the female labour force in the five-year period, substantiating the current trend of women whose family responsibilities are ended to re-enter the labour market. This age group also showed the largest percentage increase in the participation rate, from 32.1 in 1961 to 37.8 in 1966, followed closely by the 35-44 age group, with an increase from 30.2 to 35.7 per cent during the same period.

The majority of women work full time: in 1966, about 55 per cent of female workers worked from 35 to 44 hours per week. But one third of women, or more than twice the proportion for men, worked less than 35 hours per week.

In 1966 women comprised slightly more than 6 out of 10 of all employees in establishments classified as being in the community service category, such as schools, hospitals and social agencies, and in business and personal service groups, such as laundries, dry cleaning establishments, hotels and restaurants. Almost half the employees in finance, insurance and real estate were women, and one third in trade. In manufacturing, the ratio of women to all workers was 1 to 5. Looking at selected occupations in 1966, two thirds of all clerical workers were women. More than half of those in service and recreation occupations, one third in trade, and less than half in professional and technical occupations were women.

The growth of the female labour force and employment has corresponded with "the industrial development of Canada, social and cultural changes, and the increasing urbanization of the population. The development of service industries, the use of industrial machines, rationalization of industrial processes, and the growth of commercial and financial activities have all helped create greater job opportunities for women."<sup>4</sup> By taking an active part in economic activities, women have helped to advance economic growth and the standard of living in Canada. Other factors which contributed to the increased female labour force participation rate include reduction in domestic work, earlier marriages and smaller families, full employment policies which induced women to meet relative manpower shortages, better education of women and, finally, a significant change in social attitudes toward working women, particularly working married women.

## **2. Development of Womanpower and Some Social and Economic Issues**

In most of the Western industrialized countries women constitute about one third of the labour force, and no country today, at whatever stage of its economic development, can dispense with the participation of substantial numbers of women in its labour force. The importance of women for the economy is, however, not limited to their participation in the work force, because their earnings have made a higher standard of living possible as well as expanding the economy, which in turn has made a larger number of jobs available for them.

It is obvious that the effective development and utilization of womanpower is one aspect of manpower policies that no longer can be overlooked by governments, employers and labour organizations. This development, which is a necessary prerequisite for the achievement of political, social, cultural and economic objectives of a modern society, implies increasing the general knowledge, specific skills and the potential capacities of women. Only through the optimum use of all human resources through training and efficient and non-discriminatory allocation of jobs and skills can full employment, a satisfactory rate of economic growth and an equitable distribution of income be brought about.

---

<sup>4</sup>George W. Wilson, Scott Gordon and Stanislaw Judek, Canada: An Appraisal of Its Needs and Resources (University of Toronto Press, 1965), pp. 255-6.

The efficient utilization of womanpower is, then, of national importance and, hence, the federal government must show leadership and initiative in devising employment policies that will promote the best use of this not yet fully exploited reserve of human resources available in the country.

It is important to emphasize, however, that women constitute a distinctive part of human resources because "...the structure and the substances of the lives of most women are fundamentally determined by their functions as wives, mothers and homemakers."<sup>5</sup> While the home and family still remain at the centre of most women's lives, it is this dual role of women today — home and paid employment — that renders the discussion of womanpower a complex interplay of economic, social, political and other factors, including modern society's specific claims on women.

The emergence of women as fully accepted members of the working community, an emergence that has been called the "quiet revolution"<sup>6</sup> of our times and the political and cultural emancipation of women, evidently has not yet been completed, as the recent pronouncements against discrimination of any kind, based on sex, indicate.

The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, which is concerned with the civil, economic, social and cultural rights of women throughout member nations, stated in 1966 that discrimination against women is:

"incompatible with the dignity of women as human beings, and with the welfare of the family and society and prevents their participation, on equal terms with men, in the political, social, economic and cultural life of their countries, and is an obstacle to the full development of the potentialities of women in the service of their countries and humanity."<sup>7</sup>

On December 14, 1961, President Kennedy created the President's Commission on the Status of Women as an instrument at the national level charged with the responsibility for —

"developing recommendations for overcoming discrimination in government and private employment on the basis of sex and for developing recommendations for services which will enable women to continue their role as wives and mothers while making a maximum contribution to the world around them."<sup>8</sup>

The International Labour Organization emphasized that:

"many of the special problems faced by women with family responsibilities are not problems peculiar to women workers but are problems of the family and of society as a whole."<sup>9</sup>

In this country the federal government early in 1967 appointed a Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada, with the task of inquiring, among other things, as to "what steps might be taken by the Federal Government to ensure for women equal opportunities with men in all aspects of Canadian society" and to inquire into and report on "Laws, practices and policies concerning the employment and promotion of women in the federal Civil Service by federal crown corporations and by federal agencies."

It is no longer a question of what women are physically and mentally capable of doing for "...experience has settled the long controversy about feminine abilities and has proven that women are fit for a much

<sup>5</sup>National Manpower Council, *Womanpower* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1957), p. 3.

<sup>6</sup>Evelyn Harrison, "The Quiet Revolution," in the *Civil Service Journal*, United States Civil Service Commission, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 5-7, 22-24.

<sup>7</sup>The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, Preamble to the Draft Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, 19th Session, March 1966, Geneva.

<sup>8</sup>Executive Order 10980, establishing the President's Commission on Status of Women, December 14, 1961.

<sup>9</sup>Recommendations Concerning the Employment of Women with Family Responsibilities, 49th Session, I.L.O. Conference, June 2, 1965.

wider range of activities than merely those compatible with the commonly accepted idea of the weaker sex."<sup>10</sup> Ability to perform a given economic activity is closely related to general intelligence and the contemporary view is that "...measurable variations between men and women with respect to intelligence, abilities and aptitudes are probably not determined by sex, but are produced by differing interest, expectations and cultural experiences."<sup>11</sup> Admittedly, there is a definite difference between men and women in respect to maximum physical working capacity,<sup>12</sup> but, under modern methods of production, manual work on the farm or in the factory is less important. Another female writer, however, suspects that "there are certain fields, such as the physical sciences, mathematics and instrumental music, in which men...will always have that razor-edge of extra gift which makes all the difference," and what she asks for is "freedom to admit freely and cultivate in each sex their special superiorities."<sup>13</sup> However, this argument is of doubtful validity. In the U.S.S.R. about one third of the engineers are women, three quarters of the physicians and more than half of all professional workers are women.<sup>14</sup> It begins to look, indeed, as if our concern that we may be wasting our valuable human resources has very real significance. On the other hand, private and social investment in the education of female professionals may also mean that "a substantial part of scarce educational resources is being spent on a group of which a large proportion may subsequently revert to part-time work or retire early from their professional careers."<sup>15</sup> This observation brings up the matter of married women in the labour force.

There is little systematic and scientific research concerning married women's work patterns, and the problems of family life — marriage, divorce rates, the number and timing of births, decisions about retiring, and such things — all of which have been affected by and, in turn, affect the large increase in employment of married women. This economic phenomenon raises social problems connected with the provision of collective housekeeping services, crèches, kindergartens, child care facilities, etc., that must be established if housewives are expected to work. If this problem is neglected, then there may be "...very serious effects on women's physical and mental health, on conjugal life, and certainly on the quality of the work done by women outside their homes."<sup>16</sup>

Why, then, should married women work? Basic motives for entering the labour force by married women involve a complex of economic and socio-psychological factors. One study suggests that economic reasons for working were given by 52 per cent of the respondents interviewed while 40 per cent indicated self-fulfillment and enrichment of individuality, and the rest regarded employment as a means of maintaining or improving skills.<sup>17</sup> Perhaps it is arbitrary to make a distinction between the economic necessity to work and other motives. This distinction may vary among individual women. The U.S. National Manpower Council has drawn up a list of possible motives that draw married women into the work force: wish to realize potentialities; need for adult companionship; need for personal independence; find homemaking dull and unrewarding; not making fruitful use of free time though involved in community activities; had careers interrupted by

<sup>10</sup>Alva Myrdal and Viola Klein, *Women's Two Roles — Home and Work* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956), p. 15.

<sup>11</sup>National Manpower Council, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>12</sup>According to Dr. S. Forssman, a Swedish expert in occupational medicine, physical capacity of adult woman is approximately 25 to 30 per cent lower than that of man: see "Socio-Medical Problems of Working Women," *The Labour Gazette*, Vol. LXIV, p. 200.

<sup>13</sup>Margaret D. Mead, *Male and Female* (New York, W. Morrow, 1949), p. 382 and Chapters I and XVIII.

<sup>14</sup>See: Edward McCrensky, *Scientific Manpower in Europe* (New York, Pergamon Press, 1958).

<sup>15</sup>Rudolph C. Blitz, "Some Observations Concerning the Chilean Educational System and Its Relation to Economic Growth" in *Education and Economic Development*, by C.A. Anderson and M.J. Bowman (Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1965), p. 313.

<sup>16</sup>François Bruntz, "The Part-Time Employment of Women in Industrial Countries," *International Labour Review* November 1962), p. 429.

<sup>17</sup>Ethel McLellan, "Counselling and Training for Women Entering or Re-entering the Labour Force," in the report of a consultation on Employment of Women with Family Responsibilities (Canada Department of Labour, Women's Bureau, 1965), p. 7.



marriage and family; feel need for teachers and nurses in the community; fear empty lives when children are grown.

Whether married women work for economic or non-economic reasons, the argument most often repeated against working mothers is the too-quickly assumed adverse effects on their children. Against this argument it has been suggested that "...the all-important factor is the attitude and personality of the mother rather than the amount of time she spends with her children" and that "...the intelligent, sympathetic, loving mother may be able to give her child a sense of emotional security which is not disturbed by her regular or even her irregular absences."<sup>18</sup> It would seem then that the position of a wife and mother is not likely to be imperilled by having a fuller life in a business or professional career. Expansion of maternity leave provisions and child care facilities in our society indicate that social attitudes are gradually being brought into line with economic development and reality. The right to work or not work is an individual decision that our society must respect. The stigma attached to working wives and mothers belongs to the past.

While recognizing the significance of womanpower in the economic development of a country it may also be desirable to indicate some of the specific characteristics and shortcomings of women in comparison with men as members of the work force, and to sketch briefly some of the consequences arising from a time lag in the adjustment of employment policies and practices, including hiring, training and advancement of women.

Women do not have as strong and continuous an attachment to the labour force as men, but there is evidence of a changing trend. The increase in participation of married women in the work force indicates that single women no longer consider employment as "temporary" but expect to continue to work after marriage, and also that the child-bearing years constitute more and more an interruption rather than a cessation of employment. Nonetheless, the labour force turnover rate, that is, the extent to which workers enter and leave the work force in a given period of time, is still much higher for women than for men, and their withdrawal from employment stretches over a longer time. Consequently, these more frequent interruptions in employment adversely affect training opportunities, skills acquired through experience, and prospects of promotion to supervisory or more responsible positions; in turn, this helps to explain the weaker motivation and limited aspirations of women in seeking career advancement. Loss of skills during several years' absence from employment has a direct bearing on the occupation or level to which the mature woman can return. In addition, it is suggested that women are more prone to change employers in times of high employment, due to such things as dissatisfaction with working conditions, environment, or travelling distance. In any event, women's high turnover rate increases costs to the employer and reduces efficiency.

Another shortcoming of women workers compared to men is their rate of absence from work, which is generally higher than for men. Undoubtedly, what appears to be a higher incidence of illness among women is due in part to absences connected with illness of other family members or home responsibilities. A number of studies suggest that generalizations about illness as between men and women should be avoided, since many variables affect the incidence of illness, such as age, marital status, occupation, education, level of responsibility on the job, industry and location, to name a few.

Professor F. Zweig argues that the rate of absence has little meaning when one considers a woman's obligations. He poses these pertinent questions: "If her husband or her child or her parents or in-laws are sick, is she not justified to stay at home as much as if she herself were sick? If her children are running wild because the school holidays have started, is she not justified in making proper arrangements for them?"<sup>19</sup> It would seem therefore that greater utilization of working mothers by employers calls for permissive leave of absence policies and part-time work schedules on the part of employers, and more assistance with child care facilities on the part of communities.

---

<sup>18</sup>Alva Myrdal and Viola Klein, *Women's Two Roles*...., p. 127.

<sup>19</sup>Ferdinand Zweig, *Women's Life and Labour* (London, Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1952), p. 118.

The development of protective labour legislation in Canada has applied to all workers, irrespective of sex. Nevertheless, there are labour standards providing special health safeguards for women. Some Canadian provinces restrict night work in factories. In all provinces women are prohibited from working underground in mines. In several provinces the law requires that seats be provided for women workers if their occupation permits sitting. In some provinces the employer is required, where ten or more women are employed in an establishment, to provide a rest room equipped with couches or chairs.

In Canada there are no legal barriers to women's obtaining technical and vocational training. Equal pay for equal work has been incorporated in special acts or fair employment practices legislation by Parliament and nine provincial legislatures. Maternity leave is provided by legislation in two provinces and by regulation or policy in the federal and provincial civil services, but does not meet the recommendations of the International Labour Organization Convention with regard to cash benefits.

In 1965, the Eighth World Congress of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions adopted a Charter of Rights of Working Women, which states that women workers ought to enjoy the right of association and to derive from it the same protection and advantages as men. Although the right of association is assured in Canada to both men and women, as yet women have not taken advantage of this to join and participate in unions to the same extent as men, with the result that many of the charter's recommendations receive little emphasis in collective bargaining. Some agreements do contain equal pay clauses and maternity leave provisions. Employers themselves may adopt recommended standards in personnel policies.

The foregoing examples of special concessions to women workers are by no means exhaustive but serve to illustrate that women workers have to be treated somewhat differently in some respects from men. At the same time, too many concessions would tend to turn employers against hiring women, and married women in particular. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt suggested that the solution of the problems of women today "...lies not in the special treatment of women but in the opportunity for them to receive equal treatment with men."<sup>20</sup>

Canada has ratified Convention No. 111 of the International Labour Organization, which recommends elimination of discrimination in respect to employment and occupation based on a number of factors, including sex. Thus the federal government has assumed the obligation to promote equal employment opportunities for women by every means at its disposal, including its own personnel policies. The decision to set up the Women's Bureau of the Canada Department of Labour in 1954 gave public recognition "...to an increasingly urgent need for a more informed approach to questions relating to women workers and their work."<sup>21</sup>

Looking ahead, there is little reason to doubt that the labour force participation rates of women, which are still lower in Canada than in most industrialized countries, will continue to increase because of the pressure for a larger family income and the manpower requirements of an expanding economy. In particular, the recent dramatic decline in birth rates will probably give rise to a significant increase in the number of women in the labour force. One study concludes that "undoubtedly, the environment in which women will grow up and live — especially with regard to education, marriage, family structure, and employment opportunities and practices — will continue to change and to present them with new and varied choices concerning work."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>See: Esther Peterson, "The Status of Women in the United States," *International Labour Review*, (May 1964), p. 448.

<sup>21</sup>Marion V. Royce, "The Women's Bureau," *Canadian Labour*, June 1965, p. 5.

<sup>22</sup>National Manpower Council, *Womanpower...*, p. 56.

## CHAPTER II

### GROWTH AND COMPOSITION OF PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

The first section of this chapter is a historical review of the growth of employment in the federal service, a growth which reflected a steady advancement in the international stature of Canada, and in its political consolidation and changing internal conditions, as well as gradually increasing participation of the federal government in economic and social fields. This is followed by an analysis of current employment in the public sector. The next section is concerned with a breakdown of the geographic location of public employees by province and metropolitan area. Another section deals with the occupational composition and functional distribution of the federal employees, by sex and department. The last section examines the grade and salary structure of male and female public employees.

#### 1. Historical Review

It is proposed in this section first to trace historical trends in federal employment, and secondly to review briefly the changing attitudes toward the employment of women in the public service of this country.

a. *Growth of Federal Employment, 1912-1966* — In tracing the growth of federal employment the usual problems arising from a lack of historical data and uniformity of statistical concepts are encountered. This makes it difficult to measure precisely the trends in that employment. And an analysis of the trends in the sex distribution of the federal service is made even more difficult by the fact that no sex breakdown of a cross-section of the federal service exists prior to 1960. Some very indirect evidence will therefore have to be used.

Table 2-1 gives an indication of the growth of civilian employment in government departments proper between 1912 and 1966.

Between 1912 and 1966 employment in the federal service multiplied more than eightfold compared with about a threefold increase in the total Canadian labour force between these two terminal years. It has been suggested that there are three distinct periods of growth: (1) a modest increase in federal employment between 1912 and 1939; (2) a period of spectacular increase during World War II; and (3) since 1946, slower growth but at a level much higher than that of the pre-war period.<sup>1</sup>

(i) *The Period 1912-1939* — Federal employment began with Confederation in 1867. However, prior to 1912 there is no reliable and acceptable statistical information on public employment.<sup>2</sup>

In 1912, federal civil servants numbered approximately 20,000. This number had more than doubled by 1920, with a sharp increase between 1919 and 1920 of about 5,000 persons added to the staff of the Soldiers Civilian Re-establishment. In 1924 the number fell to about 38,000. After that year there was a steady increase, to about 46,000 in 1931. During the depression of the 1930's, the number was reduced to about 41,000 in 1936, but by 1939 had again risen to 46,000.

As for employment of women in the federal service at the time of Confederation, the problem did not exist because women were not employed. Gradually, however, some found their way into federal employment.

In 1886 there were 24 women occupying permanent positions in the Civil Service, the earliest appointment being a deputy matron in Kingston Penitentiary in 1870. During the First World War and

---

<sup>1</sup>The Royal Commission on Government Organization, *Management of the Public Service*, (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962), Vol. 1, p. 306.

<sup>2</sup>Dominion Bureau of Statistics in 1925 started publishing annual reports, the first few providing information dating back to 1912.

**TABLE 2-1**  
**GROWTH OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYMENT,**  
**1912-1966<sup>1</sup>**

Year	Number of Employees	Year	Number of Employees
1912	20,016	1936	41,132
1913	22,621	1937	42,836
1914	25,107	1938	44,143
1915	28,010	1939	46,106
1916	29,219	1940	49,739
1917	32,435	1941	66,926
1918	38,369	1942	83,781
1919	41,825	1943	104,055
1920	47,133	1944	112,658
1921	41,957	1945	115,908
1922	41,094	1946	120,557
1923	38,992	1947	125,337
1924	38,062	1948	118,370
1925	38,946	1949	123,924
1926	39,154	1950	117,196
1927	39,592	1951	124,580
1928	41,243	1952	131,646
1929	42,790	1953	126,752
1930	44,175	1954	134,645
1931	45,581	1955	136,542
1932	44,008	1956	138,734
1933	41,911	1957	144,353
1934	40,469	1958	147,867
1935	40,792	1959	147,942
	Male	Female	Total
1960	109,990	41,675	151,665
1961	114,957	43,601	158,588
1962	114,556	42,632	157,188
1963	114,989	41,832	156,821
1964	115,447	41,446	156,893
1965	117,474	42,903	160,377
1966	125,543	47,028	172,571

<sup>1</sup>1912-1924 figures are as of January, 1925-1952 as of March, and from 1953 to 1966 as of September.

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division, Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

after, there was a steady increase in the number of women public employees, and in 1928 there were 5,775 women, 7,617 in 1931,<sup>3</sup> and by 1937 more than 8,000.<sup>4</sup> In 1928, female employees accounted for 14.0 per cent of Civil Service employees, and the proportion was 16.7 and 18.7 per cent in 1931 and 1937 respectively.

(ii) *World War II* — At the beginning of the war there were more than 46,000 civil servants and salaried departmental employees not subject to the Civil Service Act. This figure had risen to 116,000 in 1945. The majority of these new employees went to departments and agencies such as National Defence,

<sup>3</sup>Proceedings of Select Special Committee of the House of Commons on Civil Service and Civil Service Act, 1932 (King's Printer, 1932); evidence given by Miss Edna Inglis, second vice-president, Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

<sup>4</sup>Royal Commission on Government Organization .... p. 315.



Comptroller of the Treasury, Wartime Prices and Trades Board, Unemployment Insurance Commission, National War Services, and Munitions and Supply.

In 1943, out of nearly 140,000 employees (including other categories of employees not under the Civil Service Act) over 50,000, or more than 35 per cent, were women.<sup>5</sup>

(iii) *Postwar Period* — Total departmental employment reached a figure of more than 120,000 in 1946 and increased to 172,000 in 1966. There was a drop in 1948 of about 7,000, due to the almost complete disappearance of the Wartime Prices and Trades Board and other wartime emergency employment. Similarly, a drop in 1953 was due to reclassification of some employees between the "old" and "new" statistical series.

The proportion of women in departmental employment has stood at about 27 per cent since 1960. Male employment in the period 1960-66 presented a picture of steadier growth than female employment, which fluctuated.

Some indication of historical trends in the employment of women may be obtained from the statistics on appointments in Table 2-2.

The Canadian Civil Service has for many decades included a relatively large proportion of temporary personnel, who have no formal status with respect to permanency of employment and normal opportunities for promotion. Neither are they entitled to annual increases in pay nor to superannuation benefits. Between the two world wars approximately one third of total federal employment was accounted for by temporary employees and this proportion rose to three fourths during the last war. It can be seen that during the 1930's most of the women were appointed on a temporary basis. Permanent appointments provide a better indication than temporary ones of historical trends in employment, because an indeterminate proportion of the temporary appointments may have been for very brief periods. At the same time, as pointed out already, there were periods when not many permanent appointments were made.

Table 2-2 shows that permanent appointments of women ranged between 15 and 20 per cent of all permanent appointments during the twenties, were very low during the depression years, increased somewhat during the war years 1939-45, and ran at about 25 per cent during most years in the early fifties. In the fifties limitations were placed upon the length of time employees could remain on temporary status, and statistics on temporary employees were no longer collected. However, considerable use has continued to be made of six-month "term" appointments. This, together with the higher separation rates for female employees, discussed elsewhere in this study, would account to a large extent for the discrepancy between the 40-50 per cent annual female appointments between 1955 and 1965, as shown in Table 2-2, and the 27 per cent of female incumbents shown in Table 2-1.<sup>6</sup>

Disregarding the nature of the appointment, female public appointees steadily increased their proportion of the total, from 15.6 per cent in 1920 to 26 per cent in 1931. The proportion declined during the depression years, but with the outbreak of war in 1939 started to climb, reaching 22.2 per cent, in that year and a peak of 65.4 per cent in 1943. Again the percentage of female appointees declined, with more appointments of male war veterans in the immediate postwar years. Since 1951 the female percentage of total appointments under the Civil Service Act has ranged from 40 to 50 per cent per annum.

*b. Women's Changing Position in the Federal Service* — Women's employment in the federal service has been a controversial problem and a trouble to the governmental conscience since Confederation. A final, if not entirely unquestioned, acceptance of female public employees today is the result of changed social attitudes and of cultural, educational and economic progress.

<sup>5</sup>Taylor Cole, *The Canadian Bureaucracy* (Duke University Press, Durham, N.C., 1949), p. 20.

<sup>6</sup>Table 2-2 includes employees of some Boards and Commissions not included in Table 2-1.

**TABLE 2-2**  
**APPOINTMENTS TO PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY POSITIONS**  
**UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, 1920-1965<sup>1</sup>**

Year	Permanent		Temporary		Total		
	Males <sup>2</sup>	Females	Males <sup>2</sup>	Females	Number	Per Cent	
						Males	Females
1920			8,331	1,551	9,882	84.4	15.6
1921			5,566	1,124	6,690	83.2	16.8
1922	1,973	347	3,362	760	6,442	82.9	17.1
1923	1,873	252	2,235	656	5,016	81.9	18.1
1924	1,630	366	1,956	468	4,420	81.2	18.8
1925	1,846	323	2,314	614	5,097	81.7	18.3
1926	1,210	305	2,156	791	4,462	75.5	24.5
1927	1,401	391	2,702	855	5,349	76.8	23.2
1928	1,644	364	3,375	816	6,199	81.0	19.0
1929	2,017	475	3,827	1,114	7,433	78.7	21.3
1930	2,041	462	3,867	1,147	7,517	78.6	21.4
1931	1,566	314	3,210	1,370	6,460	74.0	26.0
1932	534	104	1,728	433	2,799	80.9	19.1
1933	80	3	1,457	268	1,808	85.1	14.9
1934	40	1	1,879	454	2,374	80.9	19.1
1935	192	41	2,274	669	3,176	77.7	22.3
1936	706	80	4,044	903	5,733	82.9	17.1
1937	1,579	462	4,992	778	7,811	84.2	15.8
1938	685	121	4,628	935	6,369	83.5	16.5
1939	980	140	6,122	1,895	9,137	77.8	22.2
1940	1,153	293	11,769	5,991	19,206	67.3	32.7
1941	803	164	15,827	14,249	31,043	53.6	46.4
1942	563	109	19,729	28,212	48,613	41.8	58.2
1943	916	51	18,502	36,737	56,206	34.6	65.4
1944	1,197	123	13,093	24,476	38,889	36.8	63.2
1945 <sup>3</sup>	546	27	18,459	21,975	41,007	46.4	53.6
1946	481	28	38,232	14,406	53,747	72.9	27.1
1947	4,060	114	20,111	9,053	33,338	72.6	27.4
1948	5,008	482	17,981	10,453	33,924	67.8	32.2
1949	4,664	727	17,250	9,546	32,187	68.1	31.9
1950	5,679	1,976	11,143	5,386	24,184	69.6	30.4
1951	4,970	1,639	13,176	9,978	29,763	61.0	39.0
1952	5,571	1,420	14,378	10,893	32,262	61.9	38.1
1953	3,555	771	16,439	11,834	32,599	61.4	38.6
1954	1,965	919	15,044	10,711	28,639	59.4	40.6
1955	13,004	10,876			23,880	54.5	45.5
1956	13,825	12,267			26,092	53.0	47.0
1957	14,666	12,411			27,077	54.2	45.8
1958	11,890	9,454			21,344	55.8	44.2
1959	11,809	9,561			21,370	55.3	44.7
1960	11,778	8,278			20,056	58.8	41.2
1961	14,424	10,435			24,859	58.1	41.9
1962	11,507	7,831			19,338	59.6	40.4
1963	9,567	5,836			15,403	62.2	37.8
1964	8,850	9,019			17,869	49.6	50.4
1965	10,718	9,468			20,186	53.1	46.9

<sup>1</sup>Excludes seasonal appointments.

<sup>2</sup>Includes appointees under the War Service Preference statutory provisions.

<sup>3</sup>The temporary total covers new appointments as well as reassignments.

Source: Annual Reports of the Civil Service Commission.

In 1868, the Royal Commission considering the theoretical organization of the departments did not even mention any positions for women.<sup>7</sup> By 1881 there were a few women in the public service but they occupied insignificant positions.

Another Royal Commission in 1880 observed: "While we see no reason whatever why female clerks should not be quite as efficient public servants as men, we are forced to confess that there are several obstacles in the way of their employment which we fear it will be very difficult if not impossible to overcome."<sup>8</sup> It suggested that women should be placed in rooms by themselves, supervised by a person of their own sex and, in any case, the Commission doubted if there would be sufficient work for women. The Deputy Postmaster General at that time also accepted the proposition that women can work usefully, but "...it is difficult to make any arrangements for utilizing their work with convenience."<sup>9</sup>

In the 1910's the question of segregation and supervision became relatively unimportant, but that of salary and promotion became significant. The Civil Service Act of 1908 made no specific reference to sex of the candidate, but: "In cases where the sex of a candidate might be more or less of a disqualification, the deputy heads would be at liberty to specify whether men or women were required for the special positions to be filled."<sup>10</sup> The Civil Service Commission at that time argued that because of low salaries a much larger number of qualified women than men were willing to accept the positions. However, these lower positions were considered a necessary stepping stone for higher appointments of men, and the Commission "have found it necessary, therefore, ...to limit almost entirely to men, appointments in the First and Second Divisions."<sup>11</sup> The Commission argued also that it was hardly possible to appoint a woman to supervise male clerks. Women working in the Third Division could participate in competitions for positions in the First and Second Divisions, but hardly any were appointed. Restrictions were gradually removed during the First World War.

Even in the late 1920's a political scientist argued that when a female employee gets married she invariably has to leave the service and this "has disastrous results on the efficiency of the staff."<sup>12</sup> He added that "the difficulty seems to be inherent, in the woman question, and can be met in only one way: by excluding women, except in exceptional circumstances, from many of the highest posts...." He generously added: "The equality of salaries, however, should be unhesitatingly endorsed."<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, the Civil Service Act embodied the principle of equal pay for equal work, but it was stated in the early 1930's that "women claim that this does not work out in actual practice; that frequently because a woman is occupying a position it is classified at a lower grade than it would be if held by a man. This situation is attributed to the age-old prejudice towards women in business."<sup>14</sup> The author of this statement added that some departments solicited applications from men only and women with university educations had to start as stenographers to get into the service. At that time there was an almost complete absence of women in the higher ranks of the public service.<sup>15</sup>

In 1921, and for many years after, female employees upon marriage were obliged to resign. Some exceptions were made where retention of a married woman was in the public interest, or where she had to support a sick husband, or if separated and considered as self-supporting.

---

<sup>7</sup>Canadian Sessional Papers, 1869, subsec. 19.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 1880-1, subsec. 19.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., subsec. 113, p. 69.

<sup>10</sup>Civil Service Commission, First Annual Report, Sessional Papers, No. 31, (King's Printer, 1910), p. 17.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>12</sup>Robert MacGregor Dawson, *The Civil Service of Canada* (London, Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 193.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 194.

<sup>14</sup>Proceedings of (1932) Select Special Committee ... p. 241.

<sup>15</sup>Taylor Cole, *The Canadian Bureaucracy* ... p. 20.

During the last war, however, it was necessary to employ women in large numbers and the general rules prohibiting the employment of married women were relaxed, but were re-introduced as soon as the war was over.

This prohibition against married women was lifted by Order-in-Council in 1955. The Civil Service Commission observed: "It is not expected that the new policy will result in any great increase in the number of married women in the Service,"<sup>16</sup> although, despite the previous prohibition, the Commission had found it necessary to employ married women as stenographers, typists, clerks, etc.

Since 1955, of course, it has been possible to utilize the services of women, irrespective of marital status.

## 2. Women in Canada's Federal Undertakings and Public Service in 1966

Before reviewing in some detail the characteristics and composition of employees coming under the Civil Service Act, it may be worthwhile to examine overall employment in the federal sector, because the federal government, in terms of the number of people employed and size of payroll, is the single largest employer in the country.

*a. Type of Engagement* — As of September 1966, the total number of employees, civilian and military, of the federal government amounted to 476,425. A breakdown of this employment by sex and type of engagement is provided in Table 2-3.

There were 74,938 women, or 15.7 per cent of the total federal employees, working in public service proper, with various boards, in crown corporations, or as members of the Armed Forces.

While the proportion of male employees fully subject to the Civil Service Act is small, the proportion of female employees is much larger, in fact just double that of the males. The main reason for this is that, although women are not absent from the Armed Services, they represent only a small fraction of the military establishment. Almost half of the "salaried exempt" employees are members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and of the Canadian Penitentiary Service, both of which employ only a small proportion of women. The remainder, with a high proportion of women, include the sessional staff of Parliament, personal staff of cabinet ministers, deputy ministers, and members of various boards and commissions.

Six per cent of female employment was of the "prevailing rate" type. Prevailing rate employees are paid at the local rates for the class of work performed. In the case of women such work largely consists of cleaning offices.

There is considerable seasonal demand for women in the "casual employment" category, but the extent of this would not be shown, in most years, in a September balance. In September 1966, however, there would be a good deal of casual help engaged in the processing of census returns. Casual workers, mostly female, are required in the spring of each year for processing income tax returns, and a good many casuals are required for each session of Parliament.

There are, needless to say, few women among the "ships' officers and crews" category.

Classification of crown corporations used in Table 2-3 is largely the one that appears in the Financial Administration Act of 1951. Departmental corporations have functions closely allied to the regular departments of the federal government; agency corporations undertake trading service, and other operations; proprietary corporations manage lending, financial, commercial or industrial operations; "other" crown corporations include the Bank of Canada, Canadian Wheat Board, Industrial Development Bank, and the Northern Ontario Pipe Line Crown Corporation. The extent to which women are employed by these types of crown corporations would depend on their functions. Departmental and "other" crown corporations, functioning much like

---

<sup>16</sup>Civil Service Commission, Forty-Seventh Annual Report, 1955 (Queen's Printer, 1956), p. 9.



**TABLE 2-3**  
**EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE,**  
**BY TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT AND SEX, SEPTEMBER 1966**

Type of Engagement	Male	Female	Total	% of Male Total	% of Female Total	% of Total Federal Government Employment
Civilian Employees						
1 - Under the Civil Service Act						
Full-time	105,353	39,828	145,181	26.3	53.1	30.5
Part-time	487	117	604	0.1	0.2	0.1
Total, Civil Service	105,840	39,945	145,785	26.4	53.3	30.6
2 - Excluded from the Civil Service Act						
(a) Salaried Departmental Employees	19,703	7,083	26,786	5.0	9.5	5.6
(b) Employees in Crown Corporations						
(i) Agency Corporations	8,439	1,280	9,719	2.1	1.7	2.0
(ii) Proprietary Corporations	120,285	12,157	132,442	30.0	16.2	27.9
(iii) Other Crown Corporations	2,146	1,777	3,923	0.5	2.4	0.8
(iv) Departmental Corporations and Statutory Boards	5,356	1,367	6,723	1.3	1.8	1.4
Total, All Crown Corporations	136,226	16,581	152,807	33.9	22.1	32.1
(c) Prevailing Rate Employees	16,681	4,666	21,347	4.1	6.2	4.5
(d) Ships' Officers and Crews	4,013	3	4,016	1.0	—	0.8
(e) Casuals and Others	15,708	5,527	21,235	3.9	7.4	4.5
Total, Employees Excluded from Act	192,331	33,860	226,191	47.9	45.2	47.5
Total, Civilian Employees	298,171	73,805	371,976	74.3	98.5	78.1
Armed Forces	103,316	1,133	104,449	25.7	1.5	21.9
Grand Total	401,487	74,938	476,425	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

most government departments, would tend to have relatively high proportions of women in clerical and secretarial jobs. Agency and proprietary corporations (such as the Canadian National Railways) would have high proportions of "operating" and "field" staffs, who tend to be preponderately men. Approximately one fifth of all women employees in 1966 were engaged in crown corporations.

As with the crown corporations, so in other departments and agencies of government, the share of positions available to women depends upon the nature of the work to be done and also on the force of tradition in various areas of the service. Table 2-3 indicates that more than half the total number of women come under the Civil Service Act; it also shows that 27.4 per cent of public service employees under the Act are women, reflecting the large number of clerical and related occupations. A more detailed analysis of the occupations and functions performed by female employees will be undertaken later in this chapter.

*b. Employment by Department and Agency* — The complexity of the public service may be gathered from Table 2-4 which provides a breakdown of employment in the federal public service by department, agency and sex.



**TABLE 24**  
**EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE, BY DEPARTMENT, AGENCY AND SEX, SEPTEMBER 1966**

Department or Agency	Under the Civil Service Act				Excluded from the Civil Service Act								Total																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
	Full-time		Part-time		Salaried		Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
A. Parliament  Legislation The Senate House of Commons Library of Parliament Auditor General's Office (SO) Civil Service Commission (SB) Total																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			</

Department or Agency	Under the Civil Service Act				Excluded from the Civil Service Act								Total	
	Full-time		Part-time		Salaried		Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
5. Finance Department Royal Canadian Mint Comptroller of the Treasury (SO) Tariff Board (SB) Bank of Canada (OC) Industrial Development Bank (OC) Canadian Wheat Board (OC) Department of Insurance Total	276	189			12	13					23	2	311	204
	280	33			14	33					1	1	281	34
	1,990	2,424									8	30	2,012	2,487
	17	11			7								24	11
					592	659							592	659
				357	264								357	264
				192	389								192	389
	57	54		1									57	55
	2,620	2,711		1	1,174	1,358					32	33	3,826	4,103
6. Fisheries Department Fish. Res. Board of Canada (SB) Total	1,127	248			4	2	121	1	386		510	20	2,148	271
					528	138			146		12	2	686	140
	1,127	248			532	140	121	1	532		522	22	2,834	411
7. Forestry	1,010	249	1		35	8	120	3			471	66	1,637	326
8. Industry	279	182			5	6					25	32	309	220
9. Justice	152	145											152	145
10. Labour Department Unemp. Insur. Comm. (DC) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (PC) Total	296	275											333	311
	2,653	2,511			3	1	3				37	36	2,706	2,743
					1,296	795							1,296	795
	2,949	2,766			1,299	796	3				84	267	4,335	3,849
11. Mines and Technical Surveys Department Dominion Coal Board (DC) National Energy Board (SB) Atom. Energy Cont. Board (DC) Atom. Energy of Can. Ltd. (AC) Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited (PC) Total	2,638	544	2		12	11	87		345		152	47	3,236	602
	8	6			1								9	6
	56	32			5								61	32
					15	6							15	6
					3,398	608								3,398
					883	41							883	41
	2,702	582	2		4,314	666	87		345		152	47	7,602	1,295
12. National Defence Department Defence Research Board (SB) Defence Const. (1951) Ltd. (AC) Armed Forces Total	15,748	7,966	63	10	142	109	9,013	1,531	588		7,758	1,002	33,312	10,618
					1,874	469	243	7			338	39	2,455	515
					370	67							370	67
					103,316	1,133							103,316	1,133
	15,748	7,966	63	10	105,702	1,778	9,256	1,538	588		8,096	1,041	139,543	12,333

TABLE 2-4 (Continued)

Department or Agency	Under the Civil Service Act				Excluded from the Civil Service Act									
	Full-time		Part-time		Salaried				Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
13. National Health and Welfare	2,082	1,706	9	5		116	938	65	309		254	430	2,526	3,388
14. National Revenue Customs and Excise Taxation Tax Appeal Board (SB) Total	6,484 3,809 10,293	939 3,090 4,029	18 2 20	10 5 15		12 6 18		10 10 10			43 118 161	7 291 298	6,567 3,929 10,502	956 3,386 4,352
15. Northern Affairs & Natl. Res. Department Natl. Battlegrounds Comm. (AC) North. Can. Power Comm. (AC) North. Trans. Co. Ltd. (PC) Total	2,142 25,519	832 1,520	4	5		752 45 276 412	1,178 20 20 24	2,407 2 20 24	8		140 45 276 412	86 2 20 24	5,449 45 276 412	2,109 2 20 24
16. Post Office						4,295	2,689	24			696	627	30,534	4,836
17. Public Works Department National Capital Comm. (AC) Total	5,149 5,149	582 582	378 378	23 23		32 713	17 59	910 718	718		392 392	1 1	1,289 1,289	1,471 713 8,863 1,530
18. Secretary of State Department Office of the Representation Commissioner Office of the Chief Electoral Officer (SO) Public Archives and National Library (SO) National Film Board (SB) Board of Broadcast Gov. (SB) National Gallery of Canada (DC) Canadian Broadcast. Corp. (PC) Centennial Commission (AC) Office of the Custodian (AC) Public Printing and Stationary (Department) Total	351 13 138 19 41 122 684	331 4 205 18 25 82 665				7 1 1 3 6,513 101 4	6 4 280 2,124 95 4	11 7 7 1			20 1 10 3 3 91 42 6,513 101 4	21 8 3 12 38 22 42 2,124 95 4	382 8 24 149 661 22 18 25 2,124 95 4	352 6 7 224 318 18 25 2,124 95 4
19. Solicitor General Department Royal Canadian Mounted Police Total	102 303 405	84 1,039 1,123				3,598 8,039 11,737	202 77	62 62	60 60				14 14	2 2 12,218 1,464

TABLE 2-4 (Concluded)

Department or Agency	Under The Civil Service Act				Excluded from the Civil Service Act								Total	
	Full-time		Part-time		Salaried		Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		
20. Trade and Commerce Department Dominion Bureau of Stat. (SB) Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition (OC) Export Credits Insurance Corporation (PC) Total	1,090	472			181	309					175	28	1,446	809
	1,236	1,339			3		1				211	519	1,451	1,858
					975	435							975	435
	2,326	1,811			41	35					386	547	41	35
21. Transport Department Air Transport Board (SB) Board of Trans. Comm. (SB) Canadian Maritime Comm. (CD) Air Canada (PC) Atlantic Development Board (OC) Canadian National Railways (DC) National Harbours Board (AC) St. Lawrence Sea. Author. (PC) Seaway Intern. Bridge Corp. (PC) Yarmouth-Bar Hbr. Ferry (PC) Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corp. (PC) Total	9,790	1,497	1	2	142	7	1,212	8	2,152	2	1,321	47	14,618	1,563
	55	35			3						1	1	58	35
	117	52			7								125	53
	15	10			1							1	16	11
					10,137	3,424							10,137	3,424
					26	26							26	26
					94,686	5,000							94,686	5,000
					2,665	121							2,665	121
					1,634	127							1,634	127
					32	1							32	1
					210	12							210	12
					583	79							583	79
	9,977	1,594	1	2	110,126	8,797	1,212	8	2,152	2	1,322	49	124,790	10,452
22. Veterans Affairs  Grand Total	6,307	4,184	6	16		8	416	1,612			130	589	6,911	6,409
	105,353	39,828	487	117	259,245	24,797	16,681	4,666	4,013	3	15,708	5,527	401,487	74,938

Abbreviations relating to Local Status

SO — Statutory Officer

SB — Statutory Board

DC — Departmental Corporation

AC — Agency Corporation

PC — Proprietary Corporation

OC — Other Crown Corporation

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

Examination of the table shows the departments and agencies that employ large numbers of women. For instance, the Department of National Defence, with 10,618 female departmental employees plus 1,133 in the Armed Services, is certainly the largest employer of women; the C.N.R. comes next with 5,000 female employees. The Department of Veterans Affairs has a special need for women in its hospital facilities, and Air Canada employs women as air hostesses and in other non-operating jobs. Some of the departments that require a large clerical staff to take care of their enormous volume of paperwork are National Revenue (especially in the Taxation Division), the Unemployment Insurance Commission, the Comptroller of the Treasury and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics; all of these employ significant proportions of women on their staffs. The Department of National Health and Welfare and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation also employ women in a variety of capacities.

*c. Classification by Function* — Classification of public employees by function (Table 2-5) re-emphasizes the variability that exists in the utilization of women in the public service.

It is seen that the proportion of female employees is high in the fields of health, welfare (including veterans' welfare) and education. In general government work the proportion is somewhat higher than the average for the whole service, while it is low in protection services, transportation and communications, natural resources and primary industries, and in post office work. This last does not include postmasters (postmistresses), of which women form a high proportion of the total.

### 3. Geographic Location

Geographic dispersal of employees is due to the growth of Canada's population and the regional economies which require on-the-spot government services. For example, such services are provided in local offices of the departments of Manpower and Immigration, Post Office, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Public Works, and others.

*a. Provincial Distribution* — Table 2-6 gives the distribution by province of male and female employees coming under the Civil Service Act in September 1960 and 1966.

In 1966, about half the total number of female civil servants were employed in Ontario, 16 per cent in Quebec and 9 per cent in British Columbia. The remainder were scattered among the other provinces. The fact that some of the federal agencies, such as the French network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board, have their headquarters in Montreal accounts for a considerable number of the federal employees in Quebec. The following provinces experienced the highest percentage increase in public employment between 1960 and 1966: Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Ontario and Newfoundland.

Appendix 2-1 shows the provincial distribution in 1966 of all male and female public employees, including employees in crown corporations that do not come under the Civil Service Act. Again about 50 per cent of female employees were located in Ontario, 16 per cent in Quebec, 8 per cent in British Columbia and 6 per cent in Manitoba. That a fair number of women are employed in Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba is accounted for by the location of proprietary crown corporations in these provinces.

*b. Metropolitan Area Concentration* — Table 2-7 shows the degree of concentration of civil servants in the metropolitan areas.

This table shows that a much higher proportion of female than male civil servants is located in the Ottawa-Hull area. The reason is to be found in the concentration of office work at headquarters in Ottawa, together with the tendency for jobs outside Ottawa to be of the "operating" kind (e.g., customs inspectors, immigration officers, postal workers) or to require considerable travel within a region, both types traditionally filled by men.

About one in four male and one in six female employees were located in non-metropolitan areas of the country.



**TABLE 2-5**  
**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES IN DEPARTMENTS AND DEPARTMENTAL CORPORATIONS,**  
**BY FUNCTION AND SEX, SEPTEMBER 1966**

Function	Salaried		Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others		Total		% of Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Defence Services <sup>1</sup>	19,275	9,650	9,256	1,538	588	—	8,168	1,237	37,287	12,425	22.4	21.3
Veterans' Pensions and Other Benefits	6,365	4,208	416	1,612	—	—	130	589	6,911	6,409	4.1	10.9
General Government	18,864	8,269	1,564	1,048	—	—	318	483	20,746	9,800	12.4	16.7
Executive and Administrative	706	674	20	14	—	—	13	11	739	699	0.4	1.3
Legislative	1,306	1,416	—	—	—	—	211	519	1,517	1,935	0.9	3.3
Research, Planning and Statistics	20,876	10,359	1,584	1,062	—	—	542	1,013	23,002	12,434	13.7	21.3
Total	138	133	—	—	—	—	—	—	138	133	—	0.2
Protection of Persons and Property	3,616	215	—	—	—	—	10	—	3,626	215	2.2	0.4
Law Enforcement <sup>2</sup>	8,442	1,116	62	60	—	—	—	—	8,504	1,176	5.1	2.0
Corrections	918	409	—	—	—	—	14	3	932	412	0.6	0.7
Police Protection	13,114	1,873	62	60	—	—	24	3	13,200	1,936	7.9	3.3
Other	3,491	570	762	2	—	—	555	20	4,808	592	2.9	1.0
Total	233	24	219	6	—	—	403	6	855	36	0.5	—
Transportation and Communications	124	52	—	—	—	—	—	—	124	52	—	—
Airways	2,543	270	20	2	—	—	112	10	2,675	282	1.6	0.5
Highways, Roads and Bridges	2,551	341	442	—	2,889	3	1,348	22	7,230	366	4.3	0.7
Railways	380	210	—	—	—	—	—	—	380	210	0.3	0.4
Telephone, Telegraph and Wireless	9,322	1,467	1,443	10	2,889	3	2,418	58	16,072	1,538	9.6	2.6
Waterways	190	202	4	—	—	—	16	17	210	219	0.1	0.4
Other	659	374	45	10	—	—	75	43	779	427	0.4	0.7
Total	183	15	—	—	—	—	—	—	183	15	0.1	—
Health	734	1,436	9	299	—	—	139	324	882	2,059	0.6	3.5
General	1,766	2,027	58	309	—	—	230	384	2,054	2,720	1.2	4.6
Public Health	2,656	2,512	—	—	—	—	47	231	2,703	2,743	1.6	4.7
Medical, Dental and Allied Services	441	427	—	—	—	—	44	45	485	472	0.3	0.8
Hospital Care	2,474	2,093	—	—	—	—	155	248	2,629	2,341	1.6	4.0
Total	1,227	1,040	15	—	4	—	99	57	1,345	1,097	0.8	1.9
Social Welfare	6,798	6,072	15	—	4	—	345	581	7,162	6,653	4.3	11.4
Aid to Unemployed Employables	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Labour	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
National Employment Services <sup>3</sup>	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Social Welfare	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

<sup>1</sup> Excludes members of the Armed Forces.

<sup>2</sup> Includes "Office of the Solicitor General".

<sup>3</sup> Includes employees of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Branch, formerly included with "Education — Universities, Colleges and Other Schools".

TABLE 2-5 (Concluded)

Function	Salaried		Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others		Total		% of Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Recreational and Cultural Services Archives, Art Galleries, Museums and Libraries	278	285	19	—	—	—	14	12	311	297	0.2	0.5
Parks, Beaches and other Rec. Areas	642	148	1,421	—	—	—	—	—	2,063	148	1.2	0.2
Other	598	306	—	—	—	—	91	38	689	344	0.4	0.6
Total	1,518	739	1,440	—	—	—	105	50	3,063	789	1.8	1.3
Education Indian and Eskimo Schools and Schools in N.W.T.	916	1,255	12	8	—	—	63	74	991	1,337	0.6	2.3
Univer., Colleges and Other Schools	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	916	1,255	12	8	—	—	63	74	991	1,337	0.6	2.3
Natural Resources and Primary Ind. Fish and Game	1,745	411	121	1	532	—	522	22	2,920	434	1.7	0.7
Forests	988	235	115	3	—	—	402	66	1,505	304	0.9	0.5
Lands: Settlement and Agriculture	6,775	1,535	1,064	38	—	—	938	202	8,777	1,775	5.2	3.0
Minerals and Mines	1,007	262	64	—	—	—	77	22	1,148	284	0.7	0.5
Water Resources	335	71	4	—	—	—	33	3	372	74	0.3	0.1
Other	1,244	347	962	—	—	—	24	17	2,230	74	1.3	0.7
Total	12,094	2,861	2,330	42	532	—	1,996	332	16,952	3,235	10.1	5.5
Trade and Industrial Development	1,142	904	—	—	—	—	200	60	1,342	964	0.8	1.6
Public Service and Trading Enterpr.	125	8	—	—	—	—	74	—	199	8	0.1	—
Other	146	60	17	6	—	—	35	1	198	67	0.1	0.1
Civil Defense	100	133	—	—	—	—	7	16	107	149	—	0.2
International Co-operation and Ass.	1,177	693	5	15	—	—	86	130	1,268	838	0.8	1.4
Immigration and Citizenship	1,610	926	—	—	—	—	133	121	1,743	1,047	1.0	1.8
External Affairs	280	33	—	—	—	—	—	—	280	33	—	—
Bullion and Coinage	29,814	4,209	24	—	—	—	696	627	30,534	4,836	18.4	8.3
Post Office	4,461	918	15	4	—	—	454	249	4,930	1,171	2.9	2.1
Other	37,588	6,972	61	25	—	—	1,411	1,144	39,060	8,141	23.4	13.9
Total	130,899	48,395	16,681	4,666	4,013	36	15,708	5,527	167,301	58,591	100.0	100.0

4 Excludes persons paid from Postal Revenues. They numbered 8,898 Postmasters and an estimated 120 full-time and part-time assistants.

5 Excludes the following persons: Governor-General and Lieutenant-Governors (11), Judges (380), and Ministers of the Crown (26).

6 Excludes field parties (785 prevailing rate and 219 ships' employees on strength for varying periods between April 1 and December 31, 1965) of the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys. Field parties on the East Coast are included under "Waterways". To avoid revealing particulars relating to individuals, four prevailing rate employees and four casuals are excluded from the function detail but are included here.

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division.

Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

**TABLE 2-6**  
**FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT,**  
**BY PROVINCE AND SEX, SEPTEMBER 1960 AND 1966**

Province	September 1960			September 1966				Percentage Change, 1960-1966		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total		Male	Female	Total
						No.	%			
Newfoundland	1,907	340	2,247	2,138	335	2,473	1.7	12.1	-1.5	10.1
Prince Edward Island	492	116	608	590	131	721	0.5	1.6	12.9	18.6
Nova Scotia	4,887	1,738	6,625	5,474	1,738	7,212	5.0	12.0	*	8.9
New Brunswick	3,541	1,027	4,568	3,759	1,150	4,909	3.4	6.2	12.0	7.5
Quebec	16,442	4,725	21,167	18,651	5,034	23,685	16.3	13.4	6.5	11.9
Ontario	43,489	20,461	63,950	49,130	22,547	71,677	49.4	13.0	10.2	11.3
Manitoba	4,830	1,653	6,483	5,311	1,786	7,097	4.9	10.0	8.0	9.5
Saskatchewan	2,605	789	3,394	2,773	856	3,629	2.5	6.4	8.5	6.9
Alberta	5,704	1,952	7,656	6,154	2,045	8,199	5.6	7.8	4.8	7.1
British Columbia	8,915	3,250	12,165	9,438	3,607	13,045	9.0	5.9	11.0	7.2
Yukon and Northwest Territories	727	172	899	805	210	1,015	0.7	10.7	22.1	12.9
Abroad	617	181	798	1,130	389	1,519	1.0	83.1	114.9	90.4
Total	94,156	36,404	130,560	105,353	39,828	145,181	100.0	11.9	9.4	11.2

\* Less than 0.1 per cent.

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

**TABLE 2-7**  
**FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES UNDER**  
**THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, BY METROPOLITAN AREA AND SEX,**  
**SEPTEMBER 1966**

	Male		Female		Total	
	No.	% of Grand Total	No.	% of Grand Total	No.	% of Grand Total
Metropolitan areas:						
St. John's	1,074	1.1	230	0.6	1,304	0.9
Halifax	3,704	3.5	1,439	3.6	5,143	3.5
Saint John, N.B.	923	0.9	381	1.0	1,304	0.9
Montreal	11,759	11.2	3,209	8.1	14,968	10.3
Quebec	2,254	2.1	736	1.8	2,990	2.1
Ottawa-Hull	24,667	23.4	15,220	38.1	39,887	27.5
Toronto	10,970	10.4	3,428	8.6	14,398	9.9
Hamilton	1,120	1.1	379	1.0	1,499	1.0
London	2,218	2.1	947	2.4	3,165	2.2
Windsor	930	0.9	192	0.5	1,122	0.8
Kitchener-Waterloo	542	0.5	140	0.4	682	0.5
Sudbury	245	0.2	117	0.3	362	0.2
Winnipeg	4,059	3.9	1,454	3.6	5,513	3.8
Regina	879	0.8	395	1.0	1,274	0.9
Saskatoon	787	0.7	246	0.6	1,033	0.7
Calgary	1,816	1.7	665	1.7	2,481	1.7
Edmonton	2,853	2.7	1,040	2.6	3,893	2.7
Vancouver	5,347	5.1	2,028	5.1	7,375	5.1
Victoria	2,013	1.9	954	2.4	2,967	2.0
Total	78,160	74.2	33,200	83.4	111,360	76.7
Non-metropolitan areas:						
In Canada	26,063	24.7	6,239	15.7	32,302	22.2
Outside Canada	1,130	1.1	389	0.9	1,519	1.1
Total	27,193	25.8	6,628	16.6	33,821	23.3
Grand Total	105,353	100.0	39,828	100.0	145,181	100.0

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

#### 4. Age Distribution

Table 2-8 shows the age distribution of full-time Civil Service employees by sex as of September 1966.

**TABLE 2-8**  
**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES, BY SEX,**  
**SEPTEMBER 1966**

Age Group	All Employees		Males		Females	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Under 20	4,100	2.8	1,122	1.1	2,978	7.5
20 - 24	12,578	8.7	6,617	6.3	5,961	15.0
25 - 29	12,439	8.6	8,815	8.4	3,624	9.1
30 - 34	12,978	8.9	10,014	9.6	2,964	7.4
35 - 39	13,655	9.4	10,385	9.9	3,270	8.2
40 - 44	21,089	14.5	16,129	15.2	4,960	12.5
45 - 49	24,404	16.8	18,932	17.9	5,472	13.6
50 - 54	20,108	13.9	15,147	14.4	4,961	12.5
55 - 59	13,649	9.4	10,161	9.6	3,488	8.8
60 - 64	7,552	5.2	5,777	5.5	1,775	4.5
65 and over	1,183	0.8	935	0.9	248	0.6
Age not stated	1,446	1.0	1,319	1.2	127	0.3
Total All Age Groups	145,181	100.0	105,353	100.0	39,828	100.0

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

The average age of women in the public service was somewhat higher than that of the average Canadian working woman; 61 per cent of all women employed in the public service were over 35, whereas only about half the Canadian female labour force in 1966 was in that age group. The average age of women in the Civil Service, however, was less than that of men — 39 1/2 years compared with 43 1/2 years for men. Table 2-8 shows that the distribution of women by age is bimodal, unlike that of men, with peaks at 20-24 years and 45-49 years of age.

This is somewhat like the pattern revealed in the 1961 Census of Modes at ages 20-24 and 35-39.<sup>17</sup> The usual explanation for this phenomenon is that nowadays women work until the birth of the first child, keep house until all the children are in school, and then re-enter the labour force. In the case of female federal civil servants there is most likely another factor at work, namely, the time variations (shown in Table 2-2) in appointments of women to Civil Service positions. A substantial proportion of women now in the 45-49 age group would have joined the Civil Service during World War II. The drop in appointments of women after 1945 (to make room for returning servicemen and as part of a general reduction in the machinery of government) would have tended to produce a distinct trough in the age groups immediately below 45-49 in 1966. Between the ages of 40 and 55 the percentage of female employees increases as they return to employment.

The voluntary retiring age for civil servants is 60 and the normal retiring age is 65. Proportionately, the number of females who continue to work after the age of 60 is similar to that of men. In some cases, it is possible to work beyond the compulsory retiring limit of 65 years. There is evidence that the employment of women as well as of men is being so extended, because 0.6 per cent of the female public employees and 0.9 per cent of the males were 65 years and over.

<sup>17</sup>Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961 Census of Canada, Bulletin 3.1-9, Table 17.

In general, in the federal public service there is no age restriction for appointment except when a given position requires a long training period for an employee to be fully utilized. This is of particular advantage to older women workers.

## 5. Occupational Composition

During the last three decades the functions of public employees have undergone a significant transformation. Prior to the Second World War they were engaged primarily in routine clerical and administrative work. Today, however, with the expansion of government activities in various areas from scientific to economic, almost every occupation is represented in the federal service. The number of different occupations in which women have been employed has steadily increased until today women are represented in almost every occupation, predominantly in some,

*a. Broad Occupational Distribution* — Prior to the reclassification of public employees that was started in 1965, there were more than 700 classes and 1,700 grades. A class usually included all those employees engaged in the same type of work, and grades within a particular class reflected the different levels of skill and responsibility.

In order to facilitate analysis of the occupational composition of the federal employees the various classes have been combined for the purposes of this study into 14 class groups, on the basis of a broad occupational relationship and similar levels of training and education. Some of the categories are more in the nature of institutional classification — for example, the “hospital” grouping — than occupational,

Table 2-9 shows the distribution of full-time employees under the Civil Service Act by class group and sex as of September 1960 and September 1966.

The Professional group consists of those classes in which the work performed is directly associated with the specialized university training of employees. Women accounted for less than 10 per cent of the total number in this group. However, the relative increase of female professionals between 1960 and 1966 was somewhat higher than that of men.

The Administration group is subdivided into A, B and C, determined by the level of educational requirements and the nature of the work. Group A administrators are mostly involved in administering program and personnel, and are usually required to have a university education. Group B is primarily engaged in financial administration, requiring professional accounting qualifications. Group C is engaged predominantly, though not entirely, in the administration of regulations, and at least high school graduation is required. Women are scarcely represented in the Administration group except at the C level. There was some slight improvement in female representation in the Administration A and B groups between 1960 and 1966.

The Technical and Inspection group includes those classes for which university education is not normally a requirement. The absence of women in many professional and technical fields in the federal service may be explained by the scarcity of women with the requisite training in these fields.<sup>18</sup>

The Postal, Customs and Immigration group, for all practical purposes, does not employ any significant number of women.

The Office category is subdivided into the Clerical group, which includes clerks and office supervisors, and the Typing and Related group, which contains typists, stenographers, office appliance operators and their supervisors. This is the most important category as far as women are concerned because it comprises four fifths of the female employees.

The Service and Maintenance group, which includes cleaning women, has been excluded from this study.

---

<sup>18</sup>Canada Department of Labour, *Women at Work in Canada* (Ottawa, 1965), pp. 47-48.



**TABLE 2-9**  
**FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, BY CLASS GROUP AND SEX, SEPTEMBER 1960 AND 1966**

Class Group	September 1960					September 1966					Percentage Change 1960-1966		
	Number	Male		Female		Number	Male		Female		Total	Male	Female
		No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total		No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total			
Total, Professional	6,050	5,629	6.0	421	1.2	7,712	7,085	6.7	627	1.6	27.5	25.9	48.9
Administration A	1,850	1,752	1.9	98	0.3	4,444	4,280	4.1	164	0.5	140.2	150.0	67.3
Administration B	3,070	3,009	3.2	61	0.2	4,551	4,308	4.1	243	0.6	46.6	43.2	298.4
Administration C	8,871	7,133	7.6	1,738	4.8	9,388	7,823	7.4	1,565	3.9	5.8	9.7	-10.0
Total, Administration	13,791	11,894	12.7	1,897	5.3	18,383	16,411	15.6	1,972	5.0	33.3	38.0	4.0
Total, Technical and Inspection	16,199	15,290	16.2	909	2.5	18,286	17,203	16.3	1,083	2.7	12.9	12.5	19.1
Postal	21,371	20,902	22.1	469	1.3	24,993	24,259	23.0	734	1.8	16.9	16.1	56.5
Customs	5,953	5,819	6.1	134	0.4	5,444	5,278	5.0	166	0.4	-8.5	-9.3	23.9
Immigration	1,067	1,052	1.2	15	*	522	509	0.5	13	0.1	-51.1	-51.6	-13.3
Total, Postal, Customs and Immigration	28,391	27,773	29.4	618	1.7	30,959	30,046	28.5	913	2.3	9.0	8.2	47.7
Clerical	25,869	11,146	11.8	14,723	40.4	28,665	11,720	11.1	16,955	42.6	10.8	5.1	15.2
Typing and Related	16,641	1,264	1.4	15,377	42.2	16,994	1,370	1.3	15,624	39.2	2.1	8.4	1.6
Total, Office	42,510	12,410	13.2	30,100	82.6	45,669	13,090	12.4	32,579	81.8	7.4	5.5	8.2
Crafts and Trades	3,714	3,705	4.0	9	*	4,192	4,183	4.0	9	*	12.9	12.9	—
Stores and Building Services	13,230	12,992	13.7	238	0.7	13,225	13,019	12.4	206	0.5	*	0.2	-13.4
Other Service and Maintenance	1,696	1,690	1.8	6	*	1,940	1,934	1.8	6	*	14.4	14.4	—
Total, Service and Maintenance	18,640	18,387	19.5	253	0.7	19,357	19,136	18.2	221	0.5	3.8	4.1	-12.6
Total, Hospital	4,779	2,600	2.8	2,179	6.0	4,815	2,382	2.3	2,433	6.1	0.7	-8.4	11.7
Total, Legislation	200	173	0.2	27	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grand Total	130,560	94,156	100.0	36,404	100.0	145,181	105,353	100.0	39,828	100.0	11.2	11.9	9.4

\* Less than 0.1 per cent.

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

The Hospital category includes occupational classes connected with hospital work and, of course, female nurses are fairly represented in it.

The small Legislation group of employees which appears in the data for September 1960 is omitted in 1966 because it has been excluded from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Act since 1962.

*b. Predominantly Female Occupations* — As in the total Canadian economy, there are a number of office, professional, and hospital occupations that are filled almost entirely by women. This is shown in Table 2-10.

The majority of women are in the lower paid occupations, carrying out routine work in the clerical and related fields. The federal service appears to exaggerate the general tendency to fill these work groups with women. The 1961 Census showed that 96.8 per cent of stenographers, typists, and clerk-typists and

**TABLE 2-10**  
**PREDOMINANTLY FEMALE OCCUPATIONS, FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES**  
**UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, SEPTEMBER 1966**

Class Group and Title	Females		Males		Total
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
Professional	109	98.2	2	1.8	111
Dietitian and Home Economist	102	98.1	2	1.9	104
Feed Microscopist	7	100.0	—	—	7
Technical and Inspection					
Seed Analyst	66	97.1	2	2.9	68
Office					
Typing and Related	14,318	97.7	331	2.3	14,649
Typist	2,503	97.5	63	2.5	2,566
Senior Transcriber	32	100.0	—	—	32
Stenographer	2,374	98.5	36	1.5	2,410
Secretary to Executive	103	97.2	3	2.7	106
Office Composing Equipment Operator	105	86.8	16	13.2	121
Calculating Equipment Operator	123	95.3	6	4.7	129
Bookkeeping Equipment Operator	96	95.0	5	5.0	101
Stenographer Secretary 3	977	98.7	13	1.3	990
Telephone Operator and Supervisor	453	93.6	31	6.4	484
Office Equipment Operation Level	144	95.4	7	4.6	151
Secretarial Stenographic Typing Level	7,311	98.1	143	1.9	7,454
Telephone Operation Level	78	94.0	5	6.0	83
Other	19	86.4	3	13.6	22
Service and Maintenance					
Stores and Building Services					
Store Assistant	98	82.9	13	17.1	111
Hospital	2,067	98.4	33	1.6	2,100
Physical Therapist	56	94.9	3	5.1	59
Occupational Therapist	37	94.9	2	5.1	39
Nurse	1,565	98.4	26	1.6	1,591
Nurse Pending Registration	31	96.9	1	3.1	32
Dental Nurse	72	98.9	1	1.4	73
Hospital Nursing Assistant	246	100.0	—	—	246
Assistant Sterile Supply Room	60	100.0	—	—	60

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division, Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

96.8 per cent of nurses were women.<sup>19</sup> The corresponding percentages in the federal service were even higher. Opportunities for advancement are limited in the clerical occupations. Typists can become stenographers, who in turn can advance to secretarial positions. Directly above many clerical jobs are supervisory or management positions. The recent development of co-ordinators of clerical services in a department or branch opens a door for some women to move into more highly paid and responsible positions. There are a few cases where women who have started in clerical jobs have advanced to administrative positions.

Apart from clerical occupations, women find employment in traditionally female professional fields, such as home economics, library and social work. Thus two thirds of the librarians, a category excluded in Table 2-10 but included in Appendix 2-2, were women. So were 71 per cent of the social workers. Table 2-11 shows that there are 66 female seed analysts and 98 store assistants, which would seem to indicate that some imagination is being brought to bear on the utilization of womanpower in the government service.

*c. Occupations with a Minority of Women* — Women are employed in other professional areas, and in them make an important minority. This information is given in Table 2-11 and Appendix 2-2.

In 1966, among professionals, 5 out of 35 geographers were women, 6 of 21 actuaries and 4 of 23 combines investigation officers, as shown in Table 2-11. Some groups omitted in this table but included in Appendix 2-2 were statisticians, of whom women constituted 52 out of 314 incumbents; language officers, 32 women out of 77; bacteriologists, 15 women out of 54; and chemists, 40 out of 157. This last group, of which 25.5 per cent were women, is noteworthy when it is considered that in 1961, according to the Census, only 7 per cent were women.

Women are poorly represented both within and without the federal service in a number of professions such as lawyers and medical officers.

The absence of women in many professional and technical fields in the public service may or may not be related to the scarcity of women with the requisite training. Why, for instance, are women absent from such occupations as welfare officers, employment and insurance officers, radio operators, air traffic controllers, collectors (customs and excise), and excise tax officers? Perhaps in some cases a career pattern involving movement between head office and field offices may be a restraining factor.

In Administration A, 34 out of 256 Civil Service Commission officers, 30 out of 300 personnel administrators and 41 out of 342 defence production officers were women. In Administration B, 44 out of 332 treasury accountants were women. In Administration C the percentages of women were as follows: 26.1 of 2,093 employment service officers; 40.5 of 697 claims officers and 35.8 of 199 insurance officers; 33.6 of 110 external affairs officers; 45.3 of 64 editors; 19.5 of 174 public information officers; and 37.6 per cent of 229 translators. Appendix 2-2 also shows a number of additional clerical and hospital occupations in which women were either in the majority or formed sizable minorities. Nevertheless, a general examination of Table 2-11 and Appendix 2-2 shows that there are numerous occupations from which women are almost or completely excluded. To mention only a few: patent examiner, dental officer, lecturer, foreign service officer (Department of Trade and Commerce), engineer, architect, and meteorologist.

With an expanding economy and consequent government employment opportunities, women's future contribution in the Professional and Administrative groups will depend, to some extent, on women themselves and their education.

## 6. Grades and Salaries

The final section in this chapter concerns the problem of whether or not the capabilities of women are fully utilized. This problem of utilization of the female public employees is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this study. The statistical data were obtained from the Survey of Utilization of Employees in the

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

**TABLE 2-11**  
**PREDOMINANTLY MALE OCCUPATIONS,**  
**FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT,**  
**SEPTEMBER 1966**

Class Group and Title	Males		Females		Total
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
<b>PROFESSIONAL</b>					
Architect	108	97.3	3	2.7	111
Engineer	1,391	99.9	1	0.1	1,392
Patent Examiner	170	100.0	—	—	170
Scientific Officer and Senior Officer	426	96.4	16	3.6	442
Geologist	118	97.5	3	2.5	121
Meteorologist and Meteorological Officer	530	99.1	5	0.9	535
Biologist	123	93.9	8	6.1	131
Research Officer, Director, Agriculture	239	98.0	5	2.0	244
Forestry Officer, Research Officer, Director	175	100.0	—	—	175
Veterinarian	463	99.6	2	0.4	465
Dental Officer	60	100.0	—	—	60
Anthropologist	7	100.0	—	—	7
Geographer	30	85.7	5	14.3	35
Lecturer and Professor	158	100.0	—	—	158
Combines Investigation Officer	19	82.6	4	17.4	23
Actuary and Actuarial Supervisor	15	71.4	6	28.6	21
Medical Specialist	84	93.3	6	6.7	90
Solicitor	107	98.2	2	1.8	109
Advisory Counsel, Counsel Taxation	77	95.1	4	4.9	81
Food and Drug Officer	170	98.3	3	1.7	173
Examiner of Companies	21	100.0	—	—	21
Citizenship Development Officer	16	84.2	3	15.8	19
Management Analyst	90	97.8	2	2.2	92
Other	191	95.5	9	4.5	200
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Administration A	3,082	98.9	35	1.1	3,117
National Gallery Officer	14	77.8	4	22.2	18
Agricultural Officer	257	100.0	—	—	257
Agricultural Commodity Officer	54	100.0	—	—	54
Agricultural Products Inspector	1,076	99.9	1	0.1	1,077
Quality Assurance Officer	25	100.0	—	—	25
Director Taxation	34	100.0	—	—	34
Parole Service Officer	61	96.8	2	3.2	63
Development Officer, Indian Affairs	104	96.3	4	3.7	108
Trade and Commerce Officer	163	93.7	11	6.3	174
Foreign Service Officer, Trade and Commerce	207	100.0	—	—	207
Foreign Service Officer, External Affairs	405	94.4	24	5.6	429
Industrial Development and Production Officer	398	98.5	6	1.5	404
Immigration Affairs Officer	107	92.2	9	7.8	116
National Parks Officer	42	100.0	—	—	42
Finance Officer	117	95.4	5	4.1	122
Senior Officer	359	99.2	1	0.3	360
Chief of Division, Industry	37	100.0	—	—	37
Superintendent, National Defence	10	100.0	—	—	10
Privy Council Officer	10	100.0	—	—	10
Other	114	99.1	1	0.9	115

TABLE 2-11 (Continued)

Class Group and Title	Males		Females		Total
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
Administration B	2,299	99.0	23	1.0	2,322
Special Investigator, Taxation	183	99.5	1	0.5	184
Auditor, Excise Tax	463	99.1	4	0.9	467
Treasury Auditor	273	99.6	1	0.4	274
Assessor	1,099	98.9	12	1.1	1,111
Examiner	12	100.0	—	—	12
Auditor	111	99.1	1	0.9	112
Treasury Officer	154	97.5	4	2.5	158
Other	4	100.0	—	—	4
Administration C	2,109	96.6	74	3.4	2,183
Auditor, Unemployment Insurance	479	99.4	3	0.6	482
Welfare Officer	294	96.1	12	3.9	306
Field Officer, Veterans Land Act	23	100.0	—	—	23
Settlement Officer	38	100.0	—	—	38
Farm Credit Advisor	135	100.0	—	—	135
District Administrator, Veterans Affairs	8	100.0	—	—	8
Assistant Indian Agency	15	100.0	—	—	15
Superintendent, Indian Agency	13	100.0	—	—	13
Indian Affairs Officer	254	98.8	3	1.2	257
Employment and Insurance Officer	156	100.0	—	—	156
Unemployment Insurance Commission Officer	13	86.7	2	13.3	15
Manager, Employment and Claims Office	137	97.9	3	2.1	140
Welfare Administrator	34	89.5	4	10.5	38
Industrial Relations Officer	34	100.0	—	—	34
Auditor, National Defence	76	100.0	—	—	76
Audit Assistant	49	89.1	6	10.9	55
Staff Training Officer	34	94.4	2	5.6	36
Purchasing Agent	139	93.3	10	6.7	149
Other	178	86.0	29	14.0	207
TECHNICAL AND INSPECTION					
Grain Sampler	139	99.3	1	0.7	140
Grain Trackman	83	100.0	—	—	83
Grain Weighman	151	100.0	—	—	151
Grain Inspector	214	100.0	—	—	214
Inspector, Record of Performance	195	99.5	1	0.5	196
Fruit and Vegetable Inspector	107	99.1	1	0.9	108
Fishery Officer	437	100.0	—	—	437
Inspector of Stores	409	97.8	9	2.2	418
Inspecting Officer	115	100.0	—	—	115
Inspector of Standards, Trade and Commerce	301	100.0	—	—	301
Radio Inspector	171	99.4	1	0.6	172
Inspector, Civil Aviation	106	100.0	—	—	106
Inspector of Airworthiness	54	100.0	—	—	54
Ship Inspector	88	100.0	—	—	88
Inspector of Standards	52	100.0	—	—	52
Construction Supervisor	88	100.0	—	—	88
Clerk of Works	123	98.4	2	1.6	125
Radio Operator	1,008	99.5	5	0.5	1,013
Air Traffic Controller	737	99.2	6	0.8	743
Air Traffic Control Assistant	106	90.6	11	9.4	117
Printing and Stationery Officer	71	98.6	1	1.4	72



TABLE 2-11 (Concluded)

Class Group and Title	Males		Females		Total
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
Clerk Engineering	41	82.0	9	18.0	50
Map Compiler and Computer	187	92.1	16	7.9	203
Proof Assistant and Technician	76	96.2	3	3.8	79
Photographer	57	90.5	6	9.5	63
Technician, Electronics	877	99.9	1	0.1	878
Other	653	95.9	28	4.1	681
POSTAL CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION					
Postal	13,062	99.9	10	0.1	13,072
Letter Carrier	7,547	100.0	3	—	7,550
Supervisory Letter Carrier	2,515	100.0	—	—	2,515
Railway Mail Carrier	422	100.0	—	—	422
Mail Handler	1,622	100.0	—	—	1,622
Mail Despatcher	577	100.0	—	—	557
Postmaster	337	98.0	7	2.0	344
Other	62	100.0	—	—	62
Customs	2,175	98.9	24	1.1	2,199
Customs Appraiser	597	99.5	3	0.5	600
Investigator Customs and Excise	59	96.7	2	3.3	61
Chief Customs Excise Clerk	55	100.0	—	—	55
Collector, Customs and Excise	218	100.0	—	—	218
Senior Customs Excise Checking Clerk	50	98.0	1	2.0	51
Investigator, Drawback Claims	130	100.0	—	—	130
Special Exciseman	298	98.7	4	1.3	302
Computing Clerk	467	98.5	7	1.5	474
Excise Tax Officer	84	94.4	55	5.6	89
Customs Truckman	109	100.0	—	—	109
Inspector, Customs and Excise	45	100.0	—	—	45
Other	63	96.9	2	3.1	65
Immigration					
Immigration Officer	509	97.5	13	2.5	522
OFFICE					
Clerical	277	95.5	13	4.5	290
Transport Operating Clerk	47	88.7	6	11.3	53
Messenger	230	97.0	7	3.0	237
SERVICE AND MAINTENANCE					
Crafts and Trades	4,183	99.8	9	0.2	4,192
Stores and Building Services	13,006	99.2	108	0.8	13,114
Other Service and Maintenance	1,934	99.7	6	0.3	1,940
HOSPITAL					
Nursing Orderly	1,833	98.5	27	1.4	1,850
Hospital Utility Man	35	97.2	1	2.8	36
Other	93	97.5	31	2.5	124

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation  
Division, Government Employment and  
Payrolls Section.

Public Service of Canada, 1967. In this section only a general picture can be drawn from the official statistics for the whole body of employees under the Civil Service Act. These data as such make it difficult to draw any definite conclusions about the degree of utilization of or discrimination against women in the federal service. There is no objective method of determining this, but two approaches will be used in this section, namely, distribution by grade and by salary level of public employees of both sexes.

*a. Grades Distribution in 1966* — Appendix 2-2 shows distribution of selected occupations, by sex and grade, of full-time employees under the Civil Service Act at September 1966.

It is seen that almost invariably women are behind men in their career achievement. This may be explained in part by the fact that in general female employees appear to be younger than male employees, although this age differential may vary between different occupations. Another factor is the differential in the educational achievement of men and women. Neither age nor years of work and level of education can be brought into comparative analysis here. Relative advancement of male and female public employees by years of work and level of education is discussed in Chapter III, Section Two.

Table 2-12 is drawn from Appendix 2-2. Occupations were selected on the basis of a fairly good mix of both men and women.

**TABLE 2-12**  
**AVERAGE GRADE BY SEX, SELECTED OCCUPATIONS,**  
**SEPTEMBER 1966**

	Males	Females
Statisticians . . . . .	3.0	2.8
Librarians . . . . .	2.8	2.8
Language Officers . . . . .	2.1	1.5
Claims Officers . . . . .	3.4	2.7
Insurance Officers . . . . .	2.3	2.1
Editors . . . . .	2.3	1.9
Translators . . . . .	2.9	2.6
Clerical and Regulatory Level . . . . .	3.3	2.6
Clerks . . . . .	2.7	2.4

It must be borne in mind that in most of these occupational areas, persons at a senior level will have different titles or special grades above those numbered. Thus, when we compare males and females in the above table we are, by and large, referring to working, rather than top administrative levels. Nevertheless, men show consistently higher average grades than women. This table and Appendix 2-2 do indicate that for some reason female employees do not reach the higher grades in their occupations. There may be legitimate reasons, already mentioned, for this and also underutilization of womanpower in the federal service.

*b. Salary Group* — Table 2-13 gives a distribution of full-time public service employees by salary group and sex as of September 1960 and 1966.

As the previous analysis of the distribution of occupations and grades would lead one to expect, women in the federal service earn less than men. Partly, this is due to the fact that most of them are in the lower-paid occupations, and also because they occupy lower grades within these occupations. Whether certain occupations are low-paid because they attract large numbers of women is open to argument. By themselves, these statistics cannot provide a basis for the charge of discrimination, but they do indicate that the proportion of women who reach the higher levels of income is far below that of men. If we accept that women are equally as capable as men and that salary is an index of level of career advancement, then these statistics suggest that the abilities of women in the federal service are not fully utilized. Among men

**TABLE 2-13**  
**FULL-TIME CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES, BY SALARY GROUP AND SEX,**  
**SEPTEMBER 1960 AND 1966**

Salary Group	September 1960					September 1966						
	Males	Females	Total	% of Male Total	% of Female Total	% of Total	Males	Females	Total	% of Male Total	% of Female Total	% of Total
\$												
Under 2,000	455	516	971	0.4	1.4	0.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
2,000 — 2,999	6,517	15,082	21,599	7.0	41.5	16.6	1,790	5,501	7,291	1.7	13.8	5.0
3,000 — 3,999	27,865	13,887	41,752	29.6	38.2	32.0	13,158	14,895	28,053	12.5	37.4	19.3
4,000 — 4,999	34,429	5,703	40,132	36.6	15.7	30.8	27,431	11,585	39,016	26.1	29.1	26.9
5,000 — 5,999	9,870	736	10,606	10.5	2.1	8.2	28,247	5,276	33,523	26.9	13.2	23.1
6,000 — 6,999	7,062	312	7,374	7.6	0.8	5.7	12,222	1,542	13,764	11.6	3.9	9.5
7,000 — 7,999	3,684	113	3,797	4.0	0.3	3.0	6,456	466	6,922	6.1	1.2	4.8
8,000 — 8,999	1,351	18	1,369	1.4	—	1.0	4,387	238	4,625	4.1	0.6	3.2
9,000 — 9,999	1,060	16	1,076	1.1	—	0.8	2,949	115	3,064	2.8	0.3	2.1
10,000 — 10,999	386	6	392	0.4	—	0.3	2,991	75	3,066	2.8	0.2	2.1
11,000 — 11,999	512	8	520	0.5	—	0.3	1,218	43	1,261	1.2	0.1	0.9
12,000 — 12,999	345	2	347	0.4	—	0.3	1,222	36	1,258	1.2	0.1	0.9
13,000 — 13,999	278	4	282	0.2	—	0.2	621	10	631	0.6	—	0.4
14,000 — 14,999	103	—	103	0.1	—	—	899	18	917	0.8	—	0.6
15,000 — 15,999	151	1	152	0.1	—	0.1	345	6	351	0.3	—	0.2
16,000 and over	88	—	88	0.1	—	—	1,417	22	1,439	1.3	0.1	1.0
Total	94,156	36,404	130,560	100.0	100.0	100.0	105,353	39,828	145,181	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

employees 8.2 per cent earned \$10,000 and over in 1966 compared with 0.5 per cent of female employees. In September 1966, the median income of women was slightly below \$4,000 while the median income of men was approximately \$5,350. Between September 1960 and September 1966, median salaries for both males and females increased by roughly 25 per cent.

## CHAPTER III

### PROMOTION, TRAINING AND EARNINGS

President Kennedy in his statement on the Establishment of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, December 14, 1961 gave a specific directive to the chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission:

I believe that Federal employment practices should be a showcase of the feasibility and value of combining genuine equality of opportunity on the basis of merit with efficient service to the public . . . selection for any career position is hereafter made solely on the basis of individual merit and fitness, without regard to sex.<sup>1</sup>

In Canada the Royal Commission on Government Organization asserted that:

The government, in employing women, is not precluded from pioneering new standards for the community. Indeed, because of the number and wide range of jobs which it has to offer to women, the Government of Canada has a better than average opportunity for giving creative leadership.<sup>2</sup>

It is probably correct to argue that federal government employment, to a large degree, reflects the same economic, social and cultural forces and attitudes affecting hiring, advancement and working conditions of men and women that prevail in other public sectors and in private sectors throughout the country. This study, then, attempts to provide meaningful data in order to assess the validity of conventional assumptions concerning the employment of men and women in the federal service.

Comments on and analysis of employment and utilization of women in federal employment are limited exclusively to that portion of the federal government service which comes under the Civil Service Act. It excludes "prevailing rate" employees, ships' officers and crews, staff of boards, commissions, crown agencies, etc. The statistical data in tables and appendices referred to in this and following chapters (unless a different source is indicated) have drawn from the replies to a questionnaire entitled "Survey of Utilization of Employees in the Public Service of Canada" conducted by the Canada Department of Labour in the spring of 1967.

This chapter begins with a discussion on the relative advancement of male and female public employees, their assessment of promotion prospects and their reasons for poor or very poor promotion prospects. It also examines the desire of employees to enter a different line of work. Then it attempts to assess any differential in career expectations between men and women. Another section analyses the distribution of supervisory positions. Finally, it examines the expressed attitudes and preferences of men and women towards women in various working relationships such as supervisors, assistants and co-workers.

It is hoped that these findings will be useful in considering future policies and practices for improving career development opportunities for women in the public service.

#### 1. Promotion

There is no special program to develop better utilization of womanpower in the public service sector. The advancement of both men and women follows identical routes — appraisal within the depart-

---

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Committee on Federal Employment to the above Commission (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Management of the Public Service (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962), Vol. 1, p. 275.



ment or agency, rotation of duties, training and routine promotion. Competition for the latter is open to women as well as men as there is no legal barrier for women's advancement. The distribution of grades and salaries discussed in the previous chapter revealed similarities in pattern to the private sector of employment, namely, a heavy concentration of women in lower grade office positions and of men in the professions, and middle and upper administrative posts. There are relatively few women who have reached senior levels of administration. This, no doubt, reflects existing prejudice against women but may also be due to women themselves, with their somewhat lower career expectations or aspirations compared with those of men. The latter is a mere recognition of what has been the reality of women's situation. Other alleged reasons that have been advanced but which are difficult to substantiate, include: women consider themselves temporary workers; they do not have the required education and training; men have always played a dominant role in our society; women are too emotional in their approach to business matters and are more irregular in employment, with higher absenteeism and turnover rates.<sup>3</sup>

a. *Recent Promotion* – The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had received a promotion or upward reclassification within the past two years. Table 3-1 presents the percentage distribution, by sex and occupation, of persons promoted.

**TABLE 3-1**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PROMOTED WITHIN PAST TWO YEARS,**  
**BY OCCUPATION AND SEX**

Occupation			Total Responding		Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Professional						
Physical and Bio-Sciences, Medical Officer and Specialist Medical Officer	38.2	34.5	697	55	2	—
Economics, Commerce, Finance, Social Worker and Junior Executive Officer	53.3	37.8	643	90	2	—
Librarian, Language Officer, Nurse and Dietitian	63.3	44.7	210	218	3	5
Administration A						
Foreign Service Officer, Civil Service Commission Officer, Administrative Officer and Defence Production Officer	59.4	52.8	2,596	176	1	1
Administration B and C						
Taxation Officer, Employment Officer and Editor	62.8	64.0	588	75	2	—
Technical and Inspection						
Technician and Draftsman	30.5	31.7	2,130	293	11	2
Computer Systems Programmer	73.6	78.6	235	28	—	—
Postal, Customs and Immigration						
Postal Officer, Letter Carrier, Postmaster, Customs Excise Officer and Immigration Officer	15.9	—	893	8	10	—
Office						
Clerks, Supervising Head Chief, Typist and Stenographer	38.3	43.4	4,918	10,618	—	63
Electronic Data Processor and Duplicating Equipment Operator	45.9	45.0	427	816	—	—
Total Number	5,695	5,388	13,337	12,377	31	71
Per Cent Distribution	42.7	43.5				

<sup>3</sup> Report of the Committee on Private Employment, The President's Commission on the Status of Women, (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 36.

It appears that there is no difference in the degree of promotions as 43.5 per cent of female public employees were promoted during the last two years as compared with 42.7 per cent of males. But women in the Professional and Administration A categories were lagging somewhat behind men. This is significant, as these occupations usually require a university education. It also confirms the belief that fewer women reach senior levels of administration and that they progress more slowly. Even in the predominantly female occupations or where women constitute a relatively high proportion, such as librarians, language officers, nurses and dietitians, women are lagging behind men in their advancement. And it is in these professions that shortages are being experienced by the public service.

Appendix 3-1 relates promotions of men and women to broad occupational groups and current salary level. Table 3-2 shows, by sex and current salary level, public employees' advancement.

**TABLE 3-2**  
PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PROMOTED WITHIN PAST TWO YEARS,  
BY CURRENT SALARY LEVEL AND SEX

Current Salary Level	Males		Females	
	Per Cent Promoted	Total	Per Cent Promoted	Total
Under \$ 3,000	1.3	508	24.9	869
3,000—3,999	42.8	1,189	44.9	3,215
4,000—4,999	34.6	1,660	46.8	4,769
5,000—5,999	26.5	2,629	34.8	2,099
6,000—6,999	47.3	2,105	47.1	758
7,000—8,999	60.9	1,930	71.1	415
9,000—10,999	52.5	1,135	51.9	104
11,000—12,999	57.9	823	36.8	38
13,000 and over	49.0	1,259	43.8	32
Total responding		13,238		12,299
Not stated		130		149

It is seen that a great majority of women are in the lower income brackets and their advancement means less in purely monetary terms. It should also be noted that above the salary level of \$9,000, the proportion of women promoted is lower than for men. This pattern is also evident, in a more pronounced way, in the Administrative category (Appendix 3-1).

Another way of looking at advancement is to consider the length of time that individuals remain in their grades. The respondents were asked to give the total time they had been in their present grade or level and, if their position had been converted (reclassified), they were asked to add the total time spent in the class and grade held immediately prior to conversion. This is shown by sex and occupation, in Appendix 3-2. The following table summarizes these data by sex only.

**TABLE 3-3**  
LENGTH OF TIME IN PRESENT GRADE, BY SEX

Length of Time in Present Grade	Males %	Females %
Less than 2 years	42.6	42.8
2-3 years	21.6	21.3
4-5 years	13.5	12.1
6 years or more	22.3	23.8
Total number responding	13,308	12,264
Not stated	60	184

In general, there appears to be no difference between the two sexes in length of time in their present grade. Approximately one man or woman out of five remained 2 to 3 years in their present grade, one out of eight, 4 to 5 years, and one out of four, 6 or more years. An examination of Appendix 3-2 indicates that these proportions vary somewhat between different occupational groupings, but there are no significant differences between the two sexes in any specific occupation.

*b. Assessment of Promotion Prospects* — Those employees who have not been promoted or reclassified during the last two years in the federal service were asked to assess their chances for promotion during the next two years. These self-assessed prospects, by sex and occupational group, are shown in Appendix 3-3, while a summary is shown in the table below.

**TABLE 3-4**  
**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' SELF-ASSESSED PROMOTION PROSPECTS, BY SEX**

Promotion Prospects of Employees not Promoted	Males %	Females %
Excellent	17.7	9.3
Good	17.8	17.5
Fifty-fifty	15.6	12.4
Poor	24.2	27.5
Very poor	12.7	19.3
Don't know	12.0	13.8
Total number responding	7,731	7,086

About one third of the male respondents, compared to one quarter of the female, believed that their chances for promotion were excellent or good. And only about one third of the men, compared with just under one half of the women, thought that their chances were poor or very poor. These proportions vary somewhat when occupational groups are examined. A greater proportion of men than women in Professional and Administrative categories assessed their chances as excellent or good.

The next step is to analyse the reasons given for poor or very poor chances for promotion. Appendix 3-4 presents these data by sex and occupational group; Table 3-5 shows the same data by sex only.

**TABLE 3-5**  
**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' ASSESSMENT OF REASONS FOR POOR OR  
VERY POOR PROMOTION PROSPECTS, BY SEX\***

Reasons Indicated	Males %	Females %
Inadequate education and experience	3.8	2.9
Poor communication with my supervisor	3.4	1.5
My supervisor underestimates the importance of my job	7.6	5.3
Very few opportunities exist for promotion from my grade and/or position	46.8	54.2
Regardless of requirements, men are preferred to women of equal training and ability	—	6.7
Regardless of requirements, a man must be clearly superior to a woman before being selected for promotion	1.3	—
Authority for promotion too far removed	6.4	5.4
Too near retirement age	13.0	10.6
Other reasons	17.7	13.4
Total number responding	3,049	3,509

\*See also Appendix 3-7.

It is seen that about one half of both men and women who had not been promoted within the past two years feel they have reached a ceiling in their careers and see no opportunities for advancement from their present grade or position. A relatively small proportion of the women thought that discrimination was the reason. This may reflect again a spirit of submission to tradition and reality. A small minority of both men and women complained about "poor communication with my supervisor," or "my supervisor underestimates the importance of my job."

An examination of Appendix 3-4 indicates no significant difference in the pattern of reasons given by respondents in the various occupational categories. In the Professional group, three women out of five believed that "very few opportunities exist for promotion from my grade and/or position." And in the Administration category, one woman out of four thought that "regardless of requirements, men are preferred to women of equal training and ability" as the reason for their poor or very poor promotion prospects.

*c. Career Expectations* — The survey also attempted to establish whether there was any difference between men and women in career aspirations. The respondents were asked to indicate the grade they thought they should have achieved, considering their self-assessed abilities and qualifications.

Appendix 3-5 gives a percentage distribution, by sex and occupation, of public employees' assessment of the grade they believed they should be in; the table below summarizes these data by sex only.

**TABLE 3-6**  
**GRADE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES THINK THEY SHOULD**  
**HAVE ACHIEVED, BY SEX**

Grade	Males %	Females %
Present	24.5	28.0
One higher	47.1	55.0
Two or more higher	28.4	17.0
Total number responding	13,052	11,879
Not stated	316	569

Three quarters of the men and slightly less than that of the women thought they should have achieved at least one grade higher than their present grade. However, almost three men out of ten and less than two women out of ten believed they should be two or more grades higher. Women's career expectations appear slightly lower than those of men. A study in the United States claims that women appear to be less anxious or interested than men in advancement to positions of greater responsibility, "either because they planned to stop working when they married, or because further business responsibilities would be too burdensome if added to home responsibilities."<sup>4</sup>

There are rather insignificant differences in career aspirations of men and women in the various occupational groups. In the Professional group about one half of the women appeared to be satisfied with their present grade. In the Administration category one woman out of four thought she should have been two or more grades higher. It is also noticeable that one man out of three working as a technician, draftsman, electronic data processor, or duplicating equipment operator believed he should be classed at least two grades higher.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, "Women in Higher-Level Positions," 1950, p. 26.



To test further any differential in career expectations, the respondents were asked to indicate the highest grade they hoped to achieve in the next ten years if they remained in the federal service. Appendix 3-6 shows the percentage distribution of career level aspirations in the next ten years by sex and occupation. A summary is given in the following table:

**TABLE 3-7**  
**GRADE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES EXPECT TO ACHIEVE**  
**IN NEXT TEN YEARS**

Grade	Males %	Females %
Present	7.8	9.6
One to two higher	48.3	58.0
Three or more higher	43.9	32.4
Total number responding	13,091	11,798
Not stated	277	650

It again appears that women do not aspire to so high a grade level as do men. Four men out of ten expect to be at least three grades higher than at present in the next ten years, compared with three women out of ten. There are no significant differences in the pattern of career expectations of men and women within the various occupations. It is interesting to note, however, that almost half the women in economics, commerce, finance, social work and junior executive occupations expect to achieve three or more grades above their present one. The corresponding proportion for men in these occupations is three-fifths. These relatively high proportions probably reflect shortages in these occupational classes. On the other hand, in Administration B and C only one quarter of the women thought they would progress in their careers by three grades or more.

*d. Entrance into Different Line of Work* — Advancement in one's career may also be achieved through moving into a different line of work. Consequently, the respondents were asked whether they thought there was a different line of work in the federal service, involving greater responsibility and/or reward, for which they were qualified and which they would like to enter. Table 3-8 shows the percentage distribution, by sex and occupation, of public employees who expressed a desire to enter a different line of work.

It is rather surprising to find that almost half the male public employees and one third of the female employees desire to enter a different line of work. One possible interpretation of this is that a very substantial proportion of both men and women are not really happy in what they are doing at present — an aspect that goes beyond the scope of this inquiry. But it is interesting to speculate what changes could be brought about by such things as variation in type of work and rotation of duties. Another interpretation is that men have a higher level of career aspiration than women. In any case, it is improbable that all the respondents, whether in the Professional or Office categories, are in fact qualified to enter a different line of work.

*e. Supervisory Positions* — The survey also attempted to find out the distribution of supervisory positions among male and female public employees. However, a demarcation line between supervisory and non-supervisory positions is rather difficult to draw and is often arbitrary. For the purposes of this study, it was suggested in the questionnaire that a supervisory position in the federal service implies a responsibility for making recommendations regarding promotion and leave for supervised personnel, disciplinary duties and allocation of work. This definition is purely qualitative in nature and does not take into account the extent of supervision, i.e., the actual number of persons supervised.



**TABLE 3-8**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES WISHING TO ENTER DIFFERENT**  
**LINE OF WORK IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE, BY OCCUPATION AND SEX**

Occupation			Total Responding		Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
<u>Professional</u>						
Physical and Bio-Sciences and Medical Officer and Specialist Medical Officer	30.6	20.4	696	54	1	1
Economic, Commerce, Financial, Social Worker and Junior Executive Officer	40.4	26.7	643	90	4	2
Librarian, Language Officer, Nurse and Dietitian	28.8	17.5	208	211	5	10
<u>Administration A</u>						
Foreign Service Officer, Civil Service Commission Officer, Administrative Officer and Defence Production Officer	38.2	25.6	2,581	176	15	1
<u>Administration B and C</u>						
Taxation Officer, Employment Officer, Editor	33.9	41.9	587	74	4	1
<u>Technical and Inspection</u>						
Seed Analyst, Technician and Draftsman	45.6	22.3	2,110	287	31	8
Computer Systems Programmer	23.1	21.4	234	28	1	—
<u>Postal, Customs and Immigration</u>						
Postal Officer, Letter Carrier, Postmaster, Customs Excise Officer and Immigration Officer	41.8	62.5	888	8	14	—
<u>Office</u>						
Clerical Supervisory Head, Chief Clerk, Typist and Stenographer	53.5	30.7	4,877	10,476	43	204
Electronic Data Processor and Duplicating Equipment Operator	42.9	25.2	417	806	9	11
Total Number	5,898	3,644	13,241	12,210	127	238
Per Cent of Distribution	44.5	29.8				

The following analysis of the distribution of supervisory positions is related to such variables or sex, years of work in and out of the federal service, level of education and occupational group.

Table 3-9 shows the proportions of those employees holding supervisory positions by work experience, occupational group and sex.

About four men out of ten held supervisory positions compared with less than two women out of ten. And almost invariably, in every occupational group, the proportion is in favour of men. The smallest percentage difference appears in the case of the Administration occupational category, but relatively few women are to be found there, and it is in this occupational group that the greatest opportunities for more demanding supervisory positions occur.

With a few exceptions, the longer the work experience the higher the proportion of both men and women holding supervisory positions. This is to be expected.

The next table (Table 3-10) takes into consideration the level of education as a factor determining supervisory status.

While there is no definite correlation between level of education and supervisory position, a general pattern appears to be that the higher the education, the higher the proportion of both men and women holding supervisory positions. However, at each level of education, with one exception (Master's

TABLE 3-9  
PERCENTAGE OF THOSE HOLDING SUPERVISORY POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE,  
BY YEARS OF WORK IN AND OUT OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE, OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX

Years of Work In and Out of the Federal Service	Occupational Group																Total				
	Professional				Administration A, B and C				Technical and Inspection				Office								
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females						
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.					
5 Years or Less	30.9	291	15.7	108	15.1	153	39.1	23	12.9	387	72.2	97	11.3	1,490	2.2	2,871	14.3	2,321	3.1	3,089	
5-10	45.0	209	41.4	29	45.2	157	63.6	11	12.1	289	4.8	41	14.7	984	20.2	1,527	21.0	1,639	20.5	1,608	
11-15	49.7	179	50.0	38	53.5	200	60.0	20	21.9	311	10.9	46	41.9	561	16.1	1,662	39.9	1,251	17.1	1,766	
16-20	64.4	225	53.5	43	60.1	401	51.9	27	71.3	341	16.7	48	49.0	367	14.5	1,342	53.1	1,334	16.1	1,460	
20-25	61.9	223	69.4	32	67.6	383	83.3	30	31.7	303	29.0	31	40.9	259	22.4	1,430	51.2	1,168	24.5	1,523	
26 Years and Over	61.9	428	56.9	116	76.7	1,878	62.3	138	34.4	712	17.5	57	49.3	1,599	28.3	2,579	59.3	4,617	30.8	2,890	
Total Number Responding		1,555		366		3,172		249		2,343		320		5,260		11,411		12,330		12,346	
Per Cent in Supervisory Positions	52.7		42.6		67.5		61.4		27.1		33		12.8		85		16.5		43.4		18.1
Not Stated		2		2		15		3				3		30.9		86		135		94	

TABLE 3-10  
PERCENTAGE OF THOSE HOLDING SUPERVISORY POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION,  
OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX

Level of Education	Occupational Group																											
	Professional						Administration A, B and C						Technical and Inspection						Office						Total			
	Males			Females			Males			Females			Males			Females			Males			Females			Males		Females	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.		
	50.0	4	—	4	67.8	171	87.5	8	27.2	349	17.2	58	33.9	1,435	16.4	3,059	35.7	1,959	16.6	3,129								
	40.0	5	25.0	4	72.4	427	46.2	26	34.9	518	22.2	36	37.6	1,437	14.0	3,184	43.2	2,387	14.4	3,250								
20.0	15	10.0	10	71.3	802	72.3	83	20.4	766	10.8	111	22.2	2,027	18.6	4,124	33.0	3,610	19.5	4,328									
33.3	15	48.4	62	66.4	452	60.0	40	19.3	466	9.7	72	48.3	348	16.9	979	43.8	1,281	19.6	1,553									
48.6	796	65.2	181	67.3	945	50.7	71	41.1	185	10.3	39	7.4	54	1.6	64	55.8	1,980	29.3	355									
55.2	494	59.8	87	55.6	365	73.7	19	41.2	34	25.0	4	—	—	—	—	54.9	894	60.9	110									
64.4	223	50.0	18	88.9	9	—	2	100.0	24	—	1	—	—	—	—	68.6	256	42.9	21									
Doctor's Degree																												
Total Number and Per Cent	52.6	1,552	42.6	366	67.5	3,171	61.4	249	27.2	2,342	13.1	321	31.3	5,302	16.5	11,410	42.5	12,357	18.1	12,346								
Not Stated				5		2		16		3		34		2		43		87		98								

degree or its equivalent), male employees have a higher proportion of supervisory positions than women. This is particularly evident in the case of the Office occupational category, despite the fact that a great majority of the women employees are in these occupations. In the Professional group women with a Bachelor's degree or higher appear to have the same opportunities for supervisory positions as men.

Respondents were asked to assess the performance of men and women in grades higher than their own in supervisory and non-supervisory positions. The following table shows this assessment by sex, and Appendix 3-7 considers also the variations among occupational groups.

**TABLE 3-11**  
**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF MEN AND WOMEN**  
**IN SUPERVISORY AND NON-SUPERVISORY POSITIONS BY SEX**

Assessment of Performance	Supervisory		Non-Supervisory	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
	%	%	%	%
Men better	67.9	34.4	42.2	9.8
Women better	1.4	15.3	2.4	25.9
No difference	15.4	31.6	38.5	46.3
No opinion	15.3	18.7	16.9	18.0
Total responding	12,988	12,002	12,963	12,144
Views not stated	380	446	405	304

A very large proportion of men, regardless of occupational classification, believes that men are better supervisors. In fact, two thirds thought so, though the remainder saw no difference or had no opinion. Among women, one third favoured men as supervisors, only about one sixth favoured women, and one third saw no difference. Men clearly show a negative attitude towards acceptance of women as supervisors with power to make decisions. This calls for further investigation into the reasons for such views and attitudes. The least prejudice seems to prevail among male professionals.

In evaluating men and women in non-supervisory tasks four men out of ten favoured men, while more than half saw no difference or had no opinion. Among women, about half stated they saw no difference in performance in non-supervisory positions as between men and women. Another quarter preferred women and only one woman out of ten preferred men. One might conclude that prejudice is mutual, although women's views might have been coloured by past experience. These attitudes, with some insignificant variations, prevail among all occupational groups.

*f. Preferences for a Woman in Various Working Relationships* — Employees were asked whether they ever worked under the direct supervision of a woman or had a woman as an immediate assistant (other than secretary) or worked closely with one or more women at levels comparable to their own. They were also asked to express their preferences with respect to men or women in these three types of working relationships. These preferences, based on actual experience, are shown by sex and occupational group in Appendices 3-8, 3-9 and 3-10. Table 3-12 summarizes these preferences by sex only.

About one third of the men had worked at some time under a woman supervisor, and two thirds of them preferred a male supervisor; only 2.6 per cent expressed a preference for a woman supervisor, and the remainder had no preference. Among men who had not worked under women supervisors, more than four fifths preferred a man, and the remainder were indifferent; practically no one had a preference for a woman supervisor. The smaller proportion of negative attitudes towards the relative ability of women as supervisors among those who had worked under a woman suggests that introduction of women into this working relationship might gradually eliminate existing negative attitudes or prejudices against women. A great majority of the women have worked under a woman supervisor, yet only one out of ten prefers a woman

TABLE 3-12  
PREFERENCES FOR MALE OR FEMALE SUPERVISOR, ASSISTANT OR CO-WORKER AS RELATED TO EXPERIENCE,  
BY SEX \*

Working Relationship	Experience of Working Under a Woman Supervisor, or with a Woman as Assistant or Co-Worker		Preferences for Male or Female								Not Stated
			Man		Woman		No Difference				
	Yes	No	With Experience	No Experience	With Experience	No Experience	With Experience	No Experience			
	No.	No.	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	No.	
Supervisor –	Males	4,885	8,355	68.8	82.2	2.6	0.2	28.6	17.6	128	
	Females	9,919	2,353	52.0	65.9	10.7	5.4	37.3	28.7	176	
Assistant	Males	5,230	8,023	36.8	52.2	11.7	6.1	51.5	41.7	115	
	Females	5,755	6,168	10.7	15.5	38.0	38.5	51.3	46.0	525	
Co-Worker –	Males	8,831	4,346	44.2	63.6	5.2	2.6	50.6	33.8	191	
	Females	10,912	1,346	16.3	32.5	31.0	33.3	52.7	34.2	190	

\*See also Appendices 3-13, 3-14 and 3-15.

supervisor, while five out of ten prefer a man; the remainder were indifferent. Among women who have not worked under women supervisors, two thirds voted for a man and only one out of twenty voted for a woman. Here again, the experience of working under women supervisors tends to decrease the preference for men.

When examined in terms of various professional groups, there are no significant differences in preferences for men or women. However, of women in Professional and Administration occupational categories who have worked under a woman, about two thirds had no preference between a man or woman supervisor. In other words, there was a greater tendency for those with a college degree to select the "no difference" answer than those without a degree. This was partly true also of men.

Any bias against a woman as an assistant appears to be smaller. While there is still a tendency among men to prefer a man as an assistant, it is less strong than their preference for a male supervisor. About half the men, with or without experience of working with a female assistant, had no preference. This proportion tended to be higher in the case of more highly educated men in Professional and Administration categories.

About half the female public employees expressed a view of "no difference" and about one third preferred another woman as an assistant. The proportion of "no difference" was somewhat higher among better educated women.

A similar pattern in preferences emerges with a woman as a co-worker. There appears to be least objection on the part of male employees, although among men with no such experience, about two thirds preferred a man as a co-worker. Females preferred other women to work with or saw "no difference," but of the women who have had no experience of working with other females as close workers one third preferred men.

### 3. Training

Public employees represent a great variety of professional, technical, clerical and industrial occupations, and, as in the private sector, training programs and courses are essential to their career development, to keep pace with rapid technological and business management changes, and to overcome shortages of specific skills. Refresher or upgrading courses may be necessary for women whose working life has been interrupted by family responsibilities. Special courses may be organized for top administrators, or for those in expanding occupation such as electronic data processing. Participation in training programs is, of course, a factor in promotional opportunities.

Training programs for public employees are generally of three main types: those organized and sponsored centrally by the Public Service Commission when training needs are common to employees of many departments and agencies; those organized by departments to meet their specialized manpower needs; and out-of-service or external courses. The training programs range widely in duration from two weeks to a full year. Some are taken on a part-time and others on a full-time basis. Participants in external courses may get time off with pay or receive some kind of financial assistance.

Candidates for training courses operated by the departments and agencies are selected by the senior officer of each branch in co-operation with the personnel officers. Quotas are allotted to departments for courses centrally organized by the Public Service Commission, based on the number of employees. Participants in outside courses are nominated by their respective departments for endorsement by the Public Service Commission and, if necessary, approval by the Treasury Board. Selection is not supposed to be based on sex.

There is no central agency collecting information on training and manpower development programs organized by departments, and so, for the purposes of this study, information was sought from departmental training officers. Unfortunately it proved to be inadequate, and the data used in this section do not indicate the extent of actual training provided for public employees. Thus it is only possible to indicate in very broad



terms whether there is a difference in availability of training opportunities between male and female public employees.

*a. Training by the Public Service Commission* — The Public Service Commission administers inter-departmental courses on a regular basis in public administration, in secretarial orientation and secretarial development, in the theory of office management (a correspondence course), in management improvement techniques and in language training (French and English). Periodically, the Commission also undertakes a training program to meet any special need common to several departments.

The following table (Table 3-13) indicates the number of participants, by sex, in Public Administration courses at basic, intermediate and senior levels and in the Management Improvement Training program at junior, intermediate and supervisory levels, of two to four weeks' duration, organized by the Commission during the fiscal years 1960-61 to 1965-66.

It is assumed that all the participants in these two courses were from the Administration occupational category. During these six fiscal years only 16 female employees per year took part — in other words, less than one per cent of the average number of women employed during this period in this occupational category. The average number of male participants in these two courses was 296, or more than two per cent of the average number of male employees in this occupational category in the same period.

**TABLE 3-13**  
**ENROLMENT IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT**  
**TRAINING PROGRAMS ORGANIZED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, BY SEX,**  
**1960- 61 TO 1965-66**

Year	Public Administration Course		Management Improvement Training Program		Total	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1960-61	149	5	32	—	181	5
1961-62	186	10	—	—	186	10
1962-63	210	13	226	13	436	26
1963-64	114	—	250	31	975	54
1964-65 <sup>1</sup>	279	10				
1965-66 <sup>2</sup>	332	13				
Total	1,270	51	508	44	1,778	95

<sup>1</sup> Includes 26 men and 2 women in the senior course in Public Administration of four months' duration.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 23 men in the senior course in Public Administration of four months' duration and 41 men and 3 women in the Personnel Administration Course of one year's duration.

Source: The Training Services Staffing Branch of the Civil Service Commission.

These are important courses, intended to raise the administrative and managerial competence of those who have responsible supervisory duties. Evidently, in some cases, the qualifications for participation in a training course are based on the position level of the employee. Since there are relatively few women at a senior administrative level, the number of women public employees participating in the senior officers' training programs is bound to be small. However, even acknowledging this, there appears to be a relatively smaller rate of participation by women in this program.

The situation, of course, is different in the secretarial field. For example, in 1964-65 the Secretarial Orientation and Development Course had an enrolment of 200, all of whom were women.

*b. Educational Leave* — This means leave of absence, with or without pay, while attending a regular university course for which academic credit is given, or while attending an approved course in an accredited school or teaching institution.

In 1965, 50 female employees received educational leave, i.e. one fourth of one percent of all women employed in the departments or agencies granting this type of leave. During the same year, 170 men or two fifths of one per cent of all male employees reported taking educational leave.<sup>5</sup>

*c. Survey's Data on Training* — The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency and duration of training courses taken by them that were either government operated or government supported (for which the employee was given time off with pay or received governmental financial assistance), on a full- or part-time basis, within the past five years or since the commencement of employment in the federal service.

Table 3-14 shows the extent of participation in these training programs, by occupational group and sex, the duration and frequency of such programs, and whether on a full- or part-time basis.

As for government-operated courses, those of two weeks to one month duration on a full-time basis appear to be important to Professional, Administration and Technical-Inspection groups. Invariably, a greater proportion of male than female employees has had such training programs. In other types of courses the differential between men and women is smaller, although in most cases proportionately fewer women participate.

Government-supported training programs, on the whole, were not used as often as government-operated ones, particularly by employees in the Office and Technical-Inspection categories. Courses of three months to one year, both full and part time, appeared to be more important for Professional, Administration and Technical-Inspection groups. Again, male employees appear to have used them more extensively than women.

Table 3-15 considers the relationship between the extent of training received and years of work in and out of the federal service.

Again, government-supported programs appear to be less used, except those of three months' to one year's duration and by male employees with more recent work experience.

As for government-operated training programs a general impression from the data is that more men were able to take advantage of such training than women in almost every period of work experience. The general tendency seems to be that the volume of training increases with length of service.

Table 3-16 examines the extent of training of female public employees by marital status. Single women, free from family responsibilities and with uninterrupted working careers, appear to have a slight advantage over married women in participation in government-operated training courses. The exception occurs in courses of one to three months' duration. Widowed, separated or divorced women seem to have had more training than either single or married women.

The same pattern, in general, emerges in the case of government-supported programs. Single women received more of this type of training than married women.

It would appear, therefore, that more training for married women to upgrade their skills, particularly after re-entering the labour force, would benefit both the public service and married women.

### **3. Median Salaries of Male and Female Public Employees in 1966**

In general, the principle of equal pay for equal work is endorsed by labour organizations and governmental legislation. By 1961, equal pay legislation had been enacted by nine provinces, and the federal Parliament had passed the Female Employees Equal Pay Act covering those workers in undertakings that

---

<sup>5</sup> Information obtained from departmental or agency training officers.

**TABLE 3-14**  
**PERCENTAGE PARTICIPATING IN GOVERNMENT-OPERATED AND – SUPPORTED TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR**  
**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Duration and Frequency of Courses	Government-Operated Programs										Government-Supported Programs																			
	Occupational Group and Sex										Occupational Group and Sex																			
	Professional			Administration A, B and C			Technical and Inspection			Office			Not Stated			Professional			Administration A, B and C			Technical and Inspection			Office			Not Stated		
	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total	Males % and Total	Females % and Total	Total			
2 Weeks – 1 Month																														
Full-time: 1-2	11.7	5.2	30.7	12.4	9.2	5.9	5.8	2.7								4.0	3.5	3.1	2.8	3.3	0.9	0.4	0.5							
More than 2 Courses	0.5	0.2	9.3	2.0	1.2	0.6	0.4	—								0.3	—	0.4	—	1.0	0.3	0.3	—							
	1,555	368	3,174	250	2,371	322	5,341	11,490	24	10	1,550	368	3,180	250	2,374	321	5,335	11,490	26	11										
Part-time: 1-2	5.9	4.9	12.3	10.0	5.6	2.2	6.8	7.6								1.1	1.4	0.8	1.2	2.8	0.9	1.8	0.9							
More than 2 Courses	1.7	0.3	5.0	1.2	1.5	0.3	2.4	—								0.1	—	0.8	—	0.6	—	—	—							
	1,549	368	3,166	251	2,375	372	5,342	11,490	33	9	1,549	368	3,164	250	2,375	322	5,339	11,490	38	10										
1-3 Months																														
Full-time: 1-2	1.0	1.1	6.2	4.0	5.9	5.6	1.1	3.2								0.8	2.2	0.3	1.2	1.6	0.6	0.2	0.2							
More than 2 Courses	—	—	—	0.4	0.6	—	—	—								0.1	0.2	—	0.4	—	—	—	—							
	1,552	368	3,178	249	2,369	321	5,342	11,490	24	12	1,548	368	3,178	250	2,375	321	5,339	11,490	25	11										
Part-time: 1-2	4.6	2.2	5.1	6.0	4.5	2.2	3.6	4.6								1.5	1.6	1.9	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.8								
More than 2 Courses	—	—	—	0.9	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.8								—	—	0.1	0.4	—	—	—	—							
	1,550	360	3,187	250	2,375	322	5,341	11,490	12	18	1,549	368	3,173	249	2,374	321	5,335	11,490	34	12										
3 Months – 1 Year																														
Full-time: 1-2	1.4	2.4	5.1	4.8	6.6	4.7	1.8	1.4								3.0	2.7	0.2	1.6	1.1	0.3	0.8	0.5							
More than 2 Courses	0.4	0.9	0.5	—	0.9	0.3	0.1	0.6								2.0	0.8	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.1							
	1,554	368	3,168	249	2,365	321	5,342	11,490	36	12	1,547	368	3,173	249	2,374	321	5,328	11,490	43	12										
Part-time: 1-2	10.0	3.0	7.7	7.2	5.4	3.4	6.8	3.0								4.3	2.4	4.4	2.0	5.8	4.7	2.3	0.8							
More than 2 Courses	1.3	1.6	0.1	0.4	1.8	0.6	1.6	0.8								2.3	1.1	1.7	0.4	2.2	1.2	0.8	—							
	1,547	368	3,183	251	2,364	322	5,342	11,489	29	10	1,550	368	3,175	250	2,375	321	5,335	11,490	30	11										

\* Total Responding.

**TABLE 3-15**  
**EXTENT OF GOVERNMENT-OPERATED AND SUPPORTED TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYEES,**  
**BY YEARS OF WORK IN AND OUT OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE AND SEX**

Duration and Frequency of Courses	Government-Operated Programs										Government-Supported Programs									
	Years of Work					Years of Work					Years of Work					Years of Work				
	5 Years or Less	6-15	16-25	26 Years or Over		5 Years or Less	6-15	16-25	26 Years or Over		5 Years or Less	6-15	16-25	26 Years or Over		5 Years or Less	6-15	16-25	26 Years or Over	
	Males	Females	% of Total	% of Total	% of Total	Males	Females	% of Total	% of Total	% of Total	Males	Females	% of Total	% of Total	% of Total	Males	Females	% of Total	% of Total	% of Total
2 Weeks — 1 Month	7.6	1.3	8.5	3.4	14.7	3.4	17.1	4.0	1.0	0.3	1.6	0.7	2.1	0.2	2.5	1.4	—	—	—	—
Full-time: 1-2	—	—	2.0	0.1	2.1	—	4.6	0.2	0.1	—	0.3	—	0.5	—	0.4	—	—	—	—	—
More than 2 Courses	*2,420	3,134	3,084	3,385	2,769	3,024	5,026	2,891	2,418	3,134	3,076	3,384	2,771	3,024	5,021	2,891	—	—	—	—
Not Stated	1	13	5	—	6	—	57	1	3	13	13	1	4	—	62	1	—	—	—	—
Part-time: 1-2	5.0	3.1	9.0	5.3	8.7	7.7	7.7	14.1	1.0	1.1	3.6	0.1	1.6	2.2	0.5	0.2	—	—	—	—
More than 2 Courses	0.2	—	0.5	—	3.4	—	4.8	0.1	—	—	—	—	0.5	—	0.5	—	—	—	—	—
Not Stated	*2,421	3,134	3,083	3,385	2,770	3,024	5,017	2,892	2,417	3,134	3,081	3,385	2,771	3,024	5,015	2,891	—	—	—	—
1-3 Months	—	13	6	—	5	—	66	—	4	13	8	—	4	—	68	1	—	—	—	—
Full-time: 1-2	1.3	1.4	2.5	4.1	2.8	4.2	4.6	3.1	0.4	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.5	1.0	0.6	0.2	—	—	—	—
More than 2 Courses	—	—	0.1	—	0.6	—	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Stated	*2,420	3,134	3,083	3,384	2,774	3,024	5,020	2,890	2,421	3,134	3,086	3,384	2,773	3,024	5,014	2,891	—	—	—	—
Part-time: 1-2	3.0	3.0	3.3	2.7	5.7	5.1	4.3	7.7	0.4	0.1	2.5	—	0.4	0.1	0.7	0.1	—	—	—	—
More than 2 Courses	—	—	1.3	2.7	—	0.1	0.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not Stated	*2,421	3,134	3,087	3,385	2,770	3,024	5,027	2,892	2,419	3,134	3,083	3,384	2,770	3,024	5,014	2,890	—	—	—	—
3 Months — 1 Year	—	13	2	—	5	—	56	—	2	13	6	1	5	—	69	2	—	—	—	—
Full-time: 1-2	4.1	1.3	2.6	3.0	4.7	0.3	2.8	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.9	0.9	1.4	0.2	1.0	0.3	—	—	—	—
More than 2 Courses	0.7	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	—	0.3	1.1	2.2	—	0.7	—	0.4	—	—	0.4	—	—	—	—
Not Stated	*2,420	3,134	3,082	3,384	2,768	3,024	5,018	2,891	2,419	3,134	3,085	3,384	2,768	3,024	5,019	2,890	—	—	—	—
Part-time: 1-2	6.6	1.3	9.4	2.7	6.6	2.8	8.3	5.8	6.5	1.3	4.5	0.1	2.6	2.0	2.0	0.3	—	—	—	—
More than 2 Courses	3.3	1.1	0.9	0.8	3.1	1.2	1.6	0.1	0.6	—	2.5	—	2.2	—	0.6	0.1	—	—	—	—
Not Stated	*2,421	3,134	3,085	3,384	2,770	3,024	5,023	2,892	2,419	3,134	3,083	3,384	2,771	3,024	5,019	2,890	—	—	—	—
Total Responding	—	13	4	1	5	—	60	—	2	13	6	1	4	—	64	2	—	—	—	—

\*Total Responding

**TABLE 3-16**  
**EXTENT OF GOVERNMENT-OPERATED AND SUPPORTED TRAINING PROGRAMS**  
**FOR FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY MARITAL STATUS**

Duration and Frequency of Courses	Government-Operated Programs				Government-Supported Programs			
	Marital Status			Not Stated	Marital Status			Not Stated
	Single	Married	Widowed, Separated or Divorced		Single	Married	Widowed, Separated or Divorced	
	% of No. Replying	% of No. Replying	% of No. Replying		% of No. Replying	% of No. Replying	% of No. Replying	
<b>2 Weeks-1 Month</b>								
Full-time: 1-2	3.3	2.5	4.1		1.2	0.3	0.1	
More than 2 Courses	0.1	—	0.1		—	—	0.1	
	* 5,145	5,375	1,827	101	5,144	5,375	1,827	102
Part-time: 1-1	9.9	4.3	9.9		1.4	0.7	0.2	
More than 2 Courses	0.1	—	0.1		—	—	—	
	* 5,145	5,376	1,827	100	5,144	5,376	1,827	101
<b>1-3 Months</b>								
Full-time: 1-2	2.6	4.8	0.3		0.7	0.1	0.1	
More than 2 Courses	—	—	—		—	—	—	
	* 5,144	5,375	1,826	103	5,145	5,375	1,826	102
Part-time: 1-2	3.2	4.6	7.9		0.1	0.1	0.1	
More than 2 Courses	0.6	0.6	1.6		—	—	—	
	* 5,145	5,376	1,826	101	5,144	5,375	1,826	103
<b>3 Months-1 Year</b>								
Full-time: 1-2	1.7	0.8	3.6		0.8	0.6	0.1	
More than 2 Courses	1.3	0.1	0.1		0.1	—	0.4	
	* 5,144	5,375	1,826	103	5,144	5,375	1,826	103
Part-time: 1-2	3.3	1.8	6.7		0.9	0.2	3.2	
More than 2 Courses	1.2	0.6	0.1		0.2	—	0.1	
	* 5,144	5,377	1,826	101	5,144	5,376	1,826	102

\*Total Responding

come under federal jurisdiction. This principle reflects a sense of equity. It is also viewed as an effective means of maintaining men's wage rates against the competition from women's cheap labour. However, most women hold jobs at the lower end of the skill ladder — jobs that require less education and training. This is not due to lack of ability but reflects the fact that "... their fate is so closely linked with their role in the family."<sup>6</sup> The great majority of women have remained at the broad employment base where less specialized skills are required, while men are moving to the narrow top. Thus, women find themselves in a vicious circle, where, on the one hand, "... the unequal remuneration of women reduces their sense of 'career' and contributes to the lack of continuity in their employment, and on the other hand, the lack of continuity in their work is one of the main reasons why they are paid at a lower rate and meet with difficulties in their promotion."<sup>7</sup> However, there is a growing tendency among women to move in greater numbers into more highly skilled work and into technical and professional fields. This reflects the higher educational level now

<sup>6</sup> Alva Myrdal and Viola Klein, *Women's Two Roles — Home and Work* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1956) p. 74.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.



attained by women, as well as a gradual breakdown of traditional prejudices and attitudes that tended to relegate them to lower paid occupations.

Since 1918 the federal government has by law been required to compensate its employees in accordance with the principle of equal pay for equal work. In Chapter II, however, it is shown that the majority of female federal employees are concentrated in the lower salary scales, and most of the men in the middle levels. The acceptance of the equal pay principle does not ensure that women will have equal opportunities with men in appointments and promotions. Given equal qualifications in terms of work experience or length of service, and education and training, the differential in earnings between men and women may reflect the differences in the kinds of jobs held, and preferences for men and women in certain positions in federal employment. The Royal Commission on Government Organization observed that "traditional views on the suitability of women for many types of work and kinds of responsibility, as well as real factors of cost resulting from higher absenteeism and turnover, undoubtedly combine to produce this result,"<sup>8</sup> (i.e., lack of equality of treatment). Differences in earnings between men and women are also due to existing barriers to promotion of women to higher levels of management, and to somewhat fewer training opportunities in their career development. All these impeding factors cannot ordinarily be regulated by legislation alone and fair adjustments require methods other than legislation.

In this section median salaries of men and women are used to indicate the degree of employee utilization.<sup>9</sup> The higher the salary the more responsible the position. Individuals are not being fully utilized unless they are employed in positions and earn salaries corresponding to their level of education and work experience as measured in terms of years of work in and out of the federal service. Therefore, if the median salary of female employees in a particular "cell" homogeneous as to qualifications (i.e., level of education and work experience) falls short of the median salary of men in the same "cell", then it follows that women are being utilized less adequately than men; in other words are under-paid, under-utilized and being subjected to discrimination.

*a. Median Salaries by Occupational Group* — Table 3-17 shows median earnings of male and female public employees in 1966 by occupational group as related to level of education and years of work in and out of the federal service. The figures in brackets indicate the number of cases in the survey. In grouping the various occupations into broader occupational categories an effort was made to take into account the educational background and current level of remuneration.

For the Professional occupational categories the initial differential in median salaries between men and women narrows with a higher level of education, but with the passage of years of work this differential increases again in favour of male employees by \$2,000 or more.

The same pattern of differentials in median salaries between men and women appeared in other occupational categories, except that actual median salaries were lower, and hence the differentials were less pronounced. Almost invariably men were earning more than women with similar education and experience. This gap in earnings widened with the passage of work experience, reflecting the factors which impeded the career development of female employees.

To validate this generalization, Table 3-18 relates median salaries of men and women to two variables only — level of education and work experience. No account is taken of occupational grouping.

It is seen from the above table that the differential in median salaries between men and women with elementary and some high school level of education during the first two years of work or less amounted to

<sup>8</sup> The Royal Commission on Government Organization, Management of the Public Service (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962), p. 275.

<sup>9</sup> In a distribution of salaries arranged in descending order, the median is the value above and below which 50 per cent of the total observations fall.

**TABLE 3-17**  
**MEDIAN SALARIES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP,**  
**LEVEL OF EDUCATION, YEARS OF WORK IN AND OUT OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE OF CANADA, AND SEX**

Occupational Group	Level of Education	Years of Work In and Out of the Federal Service							
		5 Years or Less		6-15		16-25		26 Years and Over	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
		\$000							
Professional <sup>1</sup> Physical, Bio-Sciences, Medical Officer and Specialist Med. Officer	No University	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.8 (1)	—
	Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	7.3 (43) 1	6.3 (9)	9.5 (97)	7.3 (4)	10.4 (112)	8.4 (5)	11.8 (94)	8.6 (7)
	Master's Degree or Equivalent	8.5 (32)	7.8 (5)	10.1 (52)	8.5 (4)	12.8 (45)	8.3 (5)	13.0 (58)	8.5 (2)
	Doctor's Degree	9.7 (17)	9.3 (1)	11.4 (35)	14.5 (8)	>16.0 (43)	>16.0 (4)	>16.0 (65)	>16.0 (1)
Economics, Commerce, Finance, Social Work and Junior Executive Officer	No University	—	—	5.3 (1)	—	6.3 (1)	—	7.7 (12)	5.3 (1)
	Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	6.7 (94)	5.9 (35)	10.2 (104)	9.5 (6)	12.3 (68)	9.5 (6)	12.7 (64)	10.6 (16)
	Master's Degree or Equivalent	7.6 (59)	7.4 (7)	11.6 (54)	9.8 (2)	12.1 (99)	12.5 (7)	13.0 (38)	10.8 (9)
	Doctor's Degree	10.3 (3)	10.5 (1)	12.5 (10)	>16.0 (1)	14.5 (26)	—	14.3 (11)	11.5 (1)
Librarian, Language Officer and Translator, Nurse, Dietitian and Home Economist	No University	6.3 (1)	4.6 (9)	9.3 (2)	5.3 (14)	7.8 (3)	5.6 (19)	9.9 (18)	6.2 (36)
	Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	6.3 (29)	6.4 (29)	8.6 (17)	6.9 (19)	10.1 (29)	8.6 (21)	10.4 (43)	9.7 (22)
	Master's Degree or Equivalent	7.3 (12)	7.3 (13)	8.7 (13)	8.8 (10)	9.5 (16)	9.3 (7)	10.5 (19)	10.4 (17)
	Doctor's Degree	—	—	10.5 (1)	—	8.8 (1)	—	12.5 (7)	7.3 (1)
Computer Systems Programmer	No University	6.7 (19)	4.9 (5)	7.9 (68)	7.0 (8)	8.8 (43)	7.1 (3)	9.1 (30)	7.0 (2)
	Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	7.5 (23)	6.8 (6)	11.5 (19)	—	11.8 (1)	9.8 (1)	12.2 (8)	—
	Master's Degree or Equivalent	8.4 (6)	—	—	3.3 (1)	13.0 (2)	10.5 (1)	—	—
	Doctor's Degree	—	—	12.5 (3)	—	—	—	—	—
Total, Professional Group	No University	6.7 (20)	4.7 (14)	7.9 (73)	6.6 (22)	8.8 (48)	5.9 (22)	9.1 (60)	6.2 (40)
	Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	7.0 (189)	6.3 (79)	10.0 (236)	7.4 (29)	10.9 (220)	8.7 (33)	11.8 (209)	9.8 (45)
	Master's Degree or Equivalent	7.8 (108)	7.4 (25)	10.7 (118)	8.8 (17)	12.0 (163)	9.5 (20)	12.7 (115)	10.4 (28)
	Doctor's Degree	9.8 (21)	9.8 (2)	11.8 (50)	15.1 (9)	>16.0 (70)	>16.0 (4)	>16.0 (84)	11.5 (3)

Note: Figures in brackets indicate number of persons.  
<sup>1</sup> Includes Computer Systems Programmers.

TABLE 3-17 (Concluded)

Occupational Group	Level of Education	Years of Work In and Out of the Federal Service								
		5 Years or Less		6-15		16-25		26 Years and Over		
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Administration A, B and C	Elementary, Some High School and Specialized Training  High School Graduate and Post-Secondary School  Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent  Master's or Doctor's Degree or Equivalent	—	—	6.4 (8) <sup>1</sup>	6.8 (2)	8.0 (90)	7.5 (12)	8.8 (505)	7.8 (19)	
		5.9 (6)	—	8.0 (122)	7.8 (11)	8.5 (293)	8.0 (26)	9.2 (834)	8.3 (85)	
		7.9 (91)	7.6 (21)	10.9 (151)	8.6 (12)	12.9 (264)	8.3 (14)	13.9 (442)	8.4 (24)	
		7.4 (56)	7.6 (3)	11.7 (74)	10.0 (6)	14.2 (134)	12.0 (4)	14.1 (110)	11.5 (8)	
		4.3 (11)	3.3 (4)	5.8 (68)	4.4 (13)	5.9 (104)	5.3 (21)	5.9 (156)	5.3 (12)	
	Technical and Inspection Technicians and Draftsmen	Some High School and Specialized Training	—	3.5 (6)	6.6 (83)	5.2 (9)	6.4 (184)	6.6 (9)	6.3 (235)	5.9 (9)
		High School Graduates	3.9 (132)	3.9 (41)	6.2 (273)	5.2 (31)	6.6 (179)	5.8 (14)	6.4 (104)	5.9 (11)
		Post-Secondary School	5.7 (166)	4.6 (16)	6.4 (63)	4.9 (17)	6.6 (79)	5.9 (21)	7.0 (131)	6.0 (14)
		University Education Completed	5.5 (42)	5.1 (17)	6.8 (31)	5.3 (7)	6.3 (42)	5.5 (4)	6.2 (57)	6.0 (6)
		Elementary	3.5 (272)	3.0 (722)	4.7 (347)	4.2 (932)	6.1 (215)	4.4 (880)	5.5 (562)	4.7 (505)
Office Clerks, Typists, Stenographers, Electronic Data Processor, Calculating and Bookkeeping Equipment Operator	Some High School and Specialized Training	3.1 (217)	3.0 (566)	4.9 (375)	4.6 (1,011)	5.9 (310)	4.7 (815)	4.9 (535)	5.2 (799)	
	High School Graduates	3.4 (875)	3.7 (1,555)	5.0 (737)	4.7 (986)	5.3 (52)	4.8 (877)	5.8 (359)	5.6 (743)	
	Post-Secondary School	5.5 (87)	3.3 (32)	5.0 (86)	3.7 (232)	6.3 (83)	4.9 (238)	6.0 (92)	5.5 (477)	
	University Education Completed	6.8 (1)	—	—	3.8 (7)	3.9 (6)	7.8 (1)	5.8 (48)	5.8 (56)	

Note: Figures in brackets indicate number of persons.

<sup>1</sup> Includes Computer Systems Programmers.

TABLE 3-18  
MEDIAN SALARIES OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY SEX, LEVEL OF EDUCATION,  
AND YEARS OF WORK IN AND OUT OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE OF CANADA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Excluding Postal, Customs and Immigration category.

2Figures in brackets indicate number of persons.

\$500 and increased to \$1,300 after 26 years or more of work in and out of the federal service. For persons with some high school and specialized training (e.g., business or technological) there was at first no differential but in the course of time it increased, again in favour of men. For high school graduates, the differential after 26 years of work amounted to \$2,100 and for post-secondary level of education (e.g., nursing, technological institutes or teachers' training) it amounted to \$2,800 in favour of male employees.

For persons with university education, the differentials in median salaries between male and female public employees during the first two years of work appear to be insignificant, but the gap in remuneration widens with length of work experience. Women with university education (except a very few) are, apparently, not being fully utilized, and the differential in salary exceeds, in some cases, \$4,000. This is particularly evident of the educational level of a Bachelor's degree or its equivalent.

*b. Ratios of Female-Male Median Salaries* — The differentials in salaries between men and women are highlighted more vividly in Table 3-19, which shows the ratios of female-male public employees' median salaries in 1966 by level of education and years of work.

It is seen from this table that in a few cases only were ratios of female-male median salaries in favour of female employees. In general, these differentials are widening with an increase in years of work, suggesting that women progress less rapidly in their careers than men. At the education level of high school or less, female public employees were earning, on average, about 15 per cent less than men. At the post-secondary school level, this difference amounted to about 35 per cent, and at the first degree of university level to about 25 per cent. The gap was somewhat smaller at the Master's degree or its equivalent level.

**TABLE 3-19**  
**RATIOS OF FEMALE-MALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' MEDIAN SALARIES<sup>1</sup>**  
**BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND YEARS OF WORK**  
**IN AND OUT OF THE FEDERAL SERVICE<sup>2</sup>**

Level of Education	Years of Work in and Out of the Federal Service							Mean of Ratios of Level of Education
	2 Years or Less	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26 Years and Over	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Elementary and Some High School	84.8	88.9	97.6	80.0	68.3	79.3	78.3	82.5 $\pm$ 2
Some High School and Specialized Training	100.0	103.0	91.5	75.8	78.3	76.2	85.2	87.5 $\pm$ 2
High School Graduate	103.0	115.4	98.0	73.0	74.2	55.8	73.1	84.6 $\pm$ 2
Post-Secondary School	57.9	96.0	61.5	55.6	64.5	56.6	66.7	65.5 $\pm$ 2
Bachelor's Degree or its Equivalent	92.4	91.0	54.5	79.4	74.1	76.5	55.6	74.8 $\pm$ 2
Master's Degree or its Equivalent	100.0	88.2	77.9	81.3	73.2	75.4	82.0	82.6 $\pm$ 3
Doctor's Degree	86.5	102.9	116.4	121.1	100.0	100.0	71.9	
Mean of Ratios from Elementary to Master's Degree Level	89.7 $\pm$ 2	100.0 $\pm$ 2	80.2 $\pm$ 2	74.2 $\pm$ 2	72.1 $\pm$ 2	70.0 $\pm$ 2	73.5 $\pm$ 2	

<sup>1</sup>The statistical errors in the median salaries have been calculated from the spread of the salary distributions in each cell (years of work and level of education) and the approximate numbers of the actual respondents. For the individual entries for educational levels of elementary to high school, the statistical errors in the salary ratios were found to be about 5 per cent; for the post-secondary to Master's degree levels, they varied from 3 to 10 per cent. For the Doctor's degree level, the number of respondents was too small to permit any reliable error calculations.

<sup>2</sup>Excluding Postal, Customs and Immigration Category.



## CHAPTER IV

### REGULARITY OF EMPLOYMENT

This chapter begins with empirical data on relative rates on absence from work among male and female public employees in 1966 due to casual and/or certified sick leave and special leave. Because there is a higher rate of absence among women, the problem of part-time employment is discussed next, and the views of female employees about the length of the working day presented. Another section deals with the mobility of public employees within the federal service. The last section discusses separation — and intended separation — from federal employment, an analysis of the reasons given for contemplated separation, and the new employment destination of those who say they intend to leave the federal service.

#### 1. Absence from Work

This section presents statistical information on the number of days lost by employees in 1966 through sick leave or special circumstances necessitating absence from work. It also shows the frequency of rates of absences. Both the number of days absent and frequency of absence are related to such variables as sex, age, occupational group, marital status and others.

The basic purpose of this analysis is not to assess time lost to the employer through absence, but to assess any differential between male and female employees. And although types of absence will be discussed under different headings such as sick leave and special leave, it should be pointed out that it is not always possible to determine the real cause of the absence. That is to say, sick leave may have been used on the employee's part for reasons other than illness.

##### *a. Sick Leave* — Regulations governing the public service state:

Each government employee, under Civil Service regulations, may be allowed up to 15 days' sick leave yearly, of which seven days uncertified or so-called 'casual leave,' may be taken during the year without a medical certificate. A medical certificate must be provided for absences of more than three days' duration, and for absences of any duration if the seven days of uncertified leave have been exhausted . . . . Unused sick leave credits are accumulated from year to year during the employees' period of employment.<sup>1</sup>

The Royal Commission on Government Organization suggested that the policy and administration of sick leave in the public service focuses on "... equity and appears to equate equity with uniformity of treatment," and added that "this uniformity" is due to the removal of the supervisor "... from any discretionary influence or any concern with sickness absence."<sup>2</sup> This policy has been criticized on the ground that it is not related to individual need, is wasteful and inefficient, and undermines public employees' morale.<sup>3</sup> Sick leave provisions in the public service appear to be more generous than those prevailing in the private sector. For example, where employees in the private sector are covered by sickness indemnity insurance plans they usually receive less than full pay during illness.

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of days absent in 1966 due to casual and/or certified sick leave. Table 4-1 shows, by sex and occupational group, the number of days lost.

<sup>1</sup> Regulations issued by the Governor-in-Council, March 27, 1962.

<sup>2</sup> The Royal Commission on Government Organization, *Management of the Public Service* (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962) p. 383.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

**TABLE 4-1**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CASUAL AND/OR CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	None		1-3 Days		4-7		8-12		13 or More		Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	Males		Males		Males		Males		Males		Males		Females		Males	
	Females		Females		Females		Females		Females		No.	%	No.	%		
Per Cent of Total Responding																
Professional	29.9	12.2	37.0	32.3	20.5	32.9	5.7	11.3	6.9	11.3	1,532	100.0	353	100.0	25	15
Administration A	32.7	15.7	35.8	24.4	20.2	33.1	5.6	14.0	5.7	12.8	2,480	100.0	172	100.0	116	5
Administration B and C	21.6	12.2	31.2	22.8	27.6	33.8	8.3	9.4	11.3	21.8	565	100.0	74	100.0	26	1
Technical and Inspection	18.1	9.7	25.6	21.7	32.7	30.4	12.9	19.7	10.7	18.5	2,334	100.0	309	100.0	42	14
Postal, Customs and Immigration	15.9	—	27.4	—	28.9	—	13.9	—	13.9	—	875	100.0	8	—	28	—
Office	11.2	9.4	22.7	19.5	37.2	33.2	14.8	18.4	14.1	19.5	5,166	100.0	11,131	100.0	179	366
Total Number	2,532	1,157	3,641	2,417	3,909	3,992	1,462	2,186	1,408	2,295	12,952	100.0	12,047	100.0	416	401
Per Cent Distribution	19.5	9.6	28.1	20.1	30.2	33.1	11.3	18.1	10.9	19.1						

**TABLE 4-2**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CASUAL AND/OR CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966, BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX**

Marital Status	None		1-3 Days		4-7		8-12		13 or More		Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	Males		Males		Males		Males		Males		Males		Females		Males	
	Females		Females		Females		Females		Females		No.	%	No.	%		
Per Cent of Total Responding																
Single	18.2	14.4	25.1	25.9	36.0	33.5	10.6	10.7	10.1	15.5	3,295	100.0	4,931	100.0	61	222
Married	21.0	5.2	25.0	16.4	28.3	31.3	11.3	26.7	10.4	20.4	8,954	100.0	5,235	100.0	343	142
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	8.5	9.2	33.0	15.6	35.7	25.5	14.3	14.6	14.6	25.2	282	100.0	1,791	100.0	11	36
Marital Status Not Stated	7.3	8.9	28.7	3.3	31.9	68.9	7.2	3.3	24.9	15.6	421	100.0	90	100.0	1	1
Total Number	2,532	1,157	3,640	2,417	3,909	3,992	1,463	2,186	1,408	2,295	12,952		12,047		416	401

It is readily seen that female public employees had a higher absence rate than men. The proportion of men who had no absence during the year was double that of women. About one woman out of five was absent 13 or more working days, i.e., approximately three working weeks. The ratio for the same length of absences for men was one out of ten. More than one third of the women were absent eight or more days in 1966, compared with just over one fifth of the men. (A public service employee is entitled to three weeks' annual vacation, and ten statutory holidays. The employee may also obtain special leave for valid reasons, if approved.)

There is a divergence of findings in various studies as to whether women have a higher absence rate than men because of illness. A study of records over twenty years of men and women working in a telephone company in the United States showed that women were "... more susceptible to mental and nervous disorders, high blood pressure, varicose veins, arthritis and rheumatism"<sup>4</sup> It has also been suggested that "... the double burden of family obligations and job outside caused stress and fatigue that may require medical attention and might account at least in part for the considerable incidence of nervous diseases among women."<sup>5</sup> Other factors affecting a woman's absence from work may include distance from home to the work place, the work schedule, a lower level on the occupational scale, and so on.

The more highly-trained women occupying responsible and better-paid positions are less often absent, even when they have family responsibilities, than those in the lowlier jobs. This is verified by Table 4-1. Women in the Professional and Administrative occupational categories were absent eight or more days a year, a significantly lower rate than that for women in the Office and Technical-inspection categories. The difference in use of sick leave between men and women was generally smaller in more highly-skilled occupations than the overall difference between men and women. Presumably, women in the Professional and Administrative categories are being oriented to career development and, with higher salaries, can more easily organize their home responsibilities.

Table 4-2 shows days absent on casual and/or certified sick leave, by marital status and sex.

It appears that among married women 50 per cent were absent due to casual and/or certified sick leave for eight or more working days, compared with 25 per cent of single women, whereas the proportion for single men absent for the same period was 20 per cent. As for those widowed, separated or divorced, it is interesting to note that four out of ten men and women were absent eight or more days.

Eighteen per cent of single men and 14 per cent of single women used no sick leave at all during the year. The percentages for married men and women were 21 and 5 respectively, and for widowed, separated or divorced men and women, about 9 per cent.

These findings suggest that sick leave is being used by married women for legitimate home responsibilities, possibly in connection with maternity. This seems to be confirmed when the extent of sick leave is related to age distribution. This is shown in Table 4-3.

About 45 per cent of women in the 25 to 34 age group averaged more than eight days' sick leave during the year. This percentage diminishes with age until 45 years and then rises again. The use of sick leave by women for family responsibilities decreases with age although the absence of women resulting from illness increases progressively with age. A similar pattern of absence may be observed with men.

Appendices 4-1 to 4-6 give a breakdown of the total average number of days lost as between casual sick leave and certified sick leave by sex, occupational group, marital status and age group.

A summary of these appendices shows:

Pertaining to casual sick leave, 40 per cent of women were absent five to seven days (the maximum allowed), compared with 25 per cent of men. Twenty five per cent of men

<sup>4</sup> Canada Department of Labour, Women's Bureau, "Socio-Medical Problems of Working Women," The Labour Gazette, Vol. LXIV, No. 3, p. 201.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

**TABLE 4-3**  
NUMBER OF DAYS ON CASUAL AND/OR CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966, BY SEX AND AGE GROUP

Age Group	None		1-3 Days		4-7		8-12		13 or More		Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Per Cent of Total Responding																
													No.	%	No.	%
Under 20 years	22.5	12.0	33.3	38.7	33.8	32.6	1.1	11.9	9.3	4.8	435	100.0	865	100.0	1	63
20-24	17.8	10.4	26.3	17.0	26.9	40.3	19.4	16.8	9.6	15.5	1,690	100.0	2,085	100.0	50	39
25-29	11.4	12.7	21.1	14.5	43.4	28.0	17.6	16.7	6.5	28.1	1,873	100.0	1,026	100.0	58	2
30-34	10.5	9.3	28.5	9.7	37.6	35.7	12.8	27.4	10.6	17.9	1,483	100.0	810	100.0	9	3
35-39	20.1	11.1	38.6	25.6	24.6	26.3	7.8	16.0	8.9	21.0	1,209	100.0	854	100.0	33	33
40-44	22.9	6.1	28.1	16.4	21.8	46.4	10.9	17.0	16.3	14.1	1,645	100.0	1,368	100.0	30	34
45-54	25.8	9.2	29.1	24.0	29.9	25.3	7.1	22.6	8.1	18.9	3,160	100.0	3,060	100.0	143	130
55-64	22.4	8.8	26.9	16.5	23.0	33.9	7.9	14.4	19.8	26.4	1,422	100.0	1,942	100.0	92	65
65 years and over	22.6	5.9	3.3	5.9	29.0	2.9	—	—	45.1	85.3	31	100.0	34	100.0	—	2
Total Number	2,528	1,157	3,641	2,415	3,909	3,991	1,462	2,186	1,408	2,295	12,948	12,044	416	371	—	371
Age Not Stated	4	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	4	3	—	—	—	30

**TABLE 4-4**  
FREQUENCY OF ABSENCE DUE TO CASUAL AND/OR CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966 BY SEX AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

Occupational Group	Frequency of Absence										Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	None		Once		Twice		Three Times		Four Times or More		Males		Females		Males	Females
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	No.	%				
Per Cent of Total Responding																
Professional	30.6	12.3	27.5	22.3	16.1	18.7	12.7	20.1	13.1	26.6	1,544	100.0	359	100.0	13	9
Administration A	33.4	16.4	22.6	18.8	19.5	23.3	15.6	14.2	8.9	27.3	2,585	100.0	176	100.0	11	1
Administration B and C	23.4	12.2	16.3	23.0	25.6	14.9	17.8	24.3	16.9	25.6	583	100.0	74	100.0	8	1
Technical and Inspection	17.8	11.4	13.8	10.8	20.8	14.2	14.0	22.2	33.6	41.4	2,360	100.0	316	100.0	16	7
Postal, Customs and Immigration	15.6	—	22.6	—	16.9	—	15.4	—	29.5	—	903	100.0	8	—	—	—
Office	12.5	9.0	10.6	11.2	15.8	13.7	20.1	17.3	41.0	48.8	5,212	100.0	11,241	100.0	133	256
Total Number	2,690	1,134	2,187	1,427	2,363	1,703	2,220	2,132	3,727	5,770	13,187	100.0	12,174	100.0	181	274
Per Cent Distribution	20.4	9.3	16.6	11.7	17.9	14.0	16.8	17.5	28.3	47.5						

did not use a single day of casual sick leave during the year, compared with only 13 per cent of women;

Nearly half the married, widowed, separated or divorced women were absent five to seven days on casual sick leave, compared with one third of the men of the same marital status; There was practically no difference in the use of casual sick leave between single men and single women;

For females, the heaviest use of casual sick leave occurred in the 20 to 34 age group, possibly indicating the use of such leave for family responsibilities;

Pertaining to certified sick leave, approximately one woman out five used eight or more days during the year, compared with one man out of eight;

Widowed, separated or divorced women showed the highest proportion in using eight or more days of certified sick leave;

The use of certified sick leave by both men and women increased with age.

From the point of view of an employer not only the duration of absence is important but also the frequency. It has been suggested that the "short-term absences can be much more costly than longer term absences, in direct payroll costs and through the indirect effects on employee on morale and the relationships between employees and supervisors."<sup>6</sup>

Table 4-4 relates the frequency of absence due to combined casual and/or certified sick leave of public employees in 1966 to sex and occupational group.

About half the female public employees were absent four times or more during the year, compared with little more than a quarter of the men. On the other hand, one woman out of ten did not miss a day, compared with two men out of ten.

Women in the Professional and Administrative categories were absent less often than the average for all women as a whole, although their frequency of absence was still higher than that of men in these two occupational categories.

For both men and women a definite pattern in the frequency of absence emerges, namely, the more responsible and higher the position, the less frequent the absence. For men the percentages of those who were absent four times or more ranged from 13 in Professional to 41 in Office occupational groupings. For women, the corresponding figures were 27 and 49 per cent respectively.

Table 4-5 considers sex and marital status as factors affecting the frequency of absence.

About half the married and widowed, separated or divorced women were absent four times or more during the year, compared with one quarter of men of the same marital status. It is interesting to note that for single men this proportion was somewhat higher, namely, one third. There was no significant difference in the frequency of absence between single men and women.

Table 4-6 introduces age as a factor affecting frequency of absence.

Women employees aged 20 to 34 appear to have the highest percentage of absence, four times or more during the year, again suggesting the use of sick leave for family responsibilities. Men in the same age group also appear to have the highest rate of absence. After about 35 or 40 years of age, the percentages for both men and women tend to decline, reflecting decreased family responsibilities.

*b. Special Leave* — This type of leave is granted for specific personal reasons, such as death or illness in the immediate family, or marriage. Full-time federal employees accumulate a half day's special leave credit for each month of continuous service. The credits may be carried over up to a maximum of 25 days. This cumulative practice is characteristic of the public service but not, in general, of industry or business.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Royal Commission on Government Organization, . . . , p. 382.



**TABLE 4-5**  
**FREQUENCY OF ABSENCE DUE TO CASUAL AND/OR CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966, BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX**

Marital Status	None		Once		Twice		Three Times		Four Times or More		Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males		Females		Males	Females
											Per Cent of Total Responding		Total Responding			
											No.	%	No.	%		
Single	19.2	14.9	15.2	13.4	12.2	15.0	15.2	37.7	42.5	3,346	100.0	5,044	100.0	10	109	
Married	21.8	5.2	17.4	10.1	18.7	16.5	17.3	24.8	50.6	9,128	100.0	5,216	100.0	169	161	
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	8.2	5.8	21.0	7.3	30.6	12.3	12.7	24.5	50.1	291	100.0	1,823	100.0	1	4	
Total Number	2,657	1,127	2,146	1,426	2,244	1,701	2,121	2,130	3,597	5,699	12,765	—	12,083	—	181	274
Marital Status Not Stated	33	8	40	3	119	3	99	2	130	75	421	91	—	1	—	—

**TABLE 4-6**  
**FREQUENCY OF ABSENCE DUE TO CASUAL AND/OR CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966, BY AGE GROUP AND SEX**

Age Group	Frequency of Absence										Total Responding				Absences Not Stated		
	None		Once		Twice		Three Times		Four Times or More		Males		Females		Males	Females	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	No.	%					
													Per Cent of Total Responding	No.			%
Under 20 Years	22.5	7.7	11.8	20.4	12.4	10.1	22.6	14.0	30.7	47.8	436	100.0	898	100.0	—	30	
	19.5	11.9	11.3	7.9	13.9	10.0	11.6	14.4	43.7	55.8	1,740	100.0	2,115	100.0	—	9	
	11.1	12.7	7.5	3.8	13.3	14.8	27.0	14.5	41.1	54.2	1,922	100.0	1,027	100.0	9	1	
	11.3	9.5	11.3	1.5	22.1	12.9	24.7	15.5	30.6	60.6	1,449	100.0	781	100.0	43	31	
	30-34	11.3	9.5	11.3	1.5	22.1	12.9	24.7	15.5	30.6	60.6	1,449	100.0	781	100.0	43	31
	35-39	20.9	11.5	20.1	12.0	23.8	21.1	11.7	20.4	17.5	35.0	1,228	100.0	825	100.0	14	62
	40-44	23.5	3.3	23.2	12.2	19.0	15.8	12.1	19.5	22.2	49.2	1,635	100.0	1,391	100.0	40	11
	45-54	25.9	8.6	21.7	15.7	19.5	14.9	11.1	19.1	21.8	41.7	3,245	100.0	3,099	100.0	59	92
	50-54	25.4	8.7	20.0	13.6	16.8	14.9	17.6	20.1	20.2	42.7	1,498	100.0	1,970	100.0	16	37
	55-64	23.3	5.6	3.3	11.1	13.3	—	20.0	2.8	40.0	80.6	30	100.0	36	100.0	1	—
65 Years and Over	2,685	1,105	2,187	1,429	2,362	1,704	2,221	2,130	3,727	5,774	13,182	—	12,141	—	182	273	
Total Number	4	31	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	4	34	—	—	—	—	
Age Not Stated	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

The statistical analysis of special leave is related to sex, occupational group, and marital status. In the case of female married employees, family responsibilities are also considered.

Table 4-7 shows the number of days on special leave in 1966 by sex and occupational group.

Despite arguments put forward sometimes by female employees that this type of leave is more readily available to men than to women, the statistical evidence suggests that it is in fact used slightly more by women than by men. For instance, 11.8 per cent of the women were absent three or more days on special leave, compared with 9.3 per cent of men. Approximately four fifths of the men and three quarters of the women did not use this type of leave at all during 1966.

There are no significant differences in the percentage distribution of number of days on special leave between broad occupational groups or between men and women within a particular occupational category. It may be noticed, however, that for men the percentage of those who did not miss a day ranged from 81.9 in the Professional to 75.0 in the Office occupational groups; the corresponding percentages for females were almost the same, 80.4 and 76.3 respectively. The use of special leave appears to decrease with upward movement in the occupational classifications. *Report*

The next table, 4-8, shows marital status as a factor affecting the use of special leave.

Both married men and women used special leave more extensively than single men and women; 15.7 per cent of the married women had three or more days of special leave, compared with 7.9 per cent of the single woman. The corresponding percentages for male public employees were 9.9 and 3.3 respectively. The pattern for widowed, separated or divorced men and women is similar to that for married men and women.

Table 4-9 presents statistical data on the use of special leave by married women in relation to number of children. It is seen that those married women with more children had a slightly higher percentage of special leave absence (six days or more), but they also showed the highest percentage among married women who did not take any special leave.

## 2. Part-time Employment

*a. Advantages and Disadvantages* — The Survey of Utilization of Employees in the Public Service of Canada covered only full-time employees under the Civil Service Act. However, the federal service also utilizes married women and others on a part-time basis, for a portion of the year (e.g., the Unemployment Insurance Commission), or continuously for half days (e.g., stenographers). The latter method is rather an exception. Recently, however, the Public Service Commission of Canada started a new part-time employment program to fill certain positions in Ottawa for economists, statisticians and librarians that would allow married women and others to work four to six hours a day, arranged to fit school hours. Salaries, based on qualifications and requirements of the position, are pro-rated according to the number of hours worked. The working year is from September to June with time off during Christmas and Easter holidays. This arrangement permits women to continue their professional careers and to look after their home responsibilities.

In 1943, housewives in Ottawa were mobilized as clerks or stenographers for part-time duty during either the mornings or afternoons of the work week, at rates almost exactly half the rates paid for full-time work.

United States government organizations using part-time employees report that such workers are "as productive per hour as full-time employees, or more so" and that "the largest number of part-time employees hired had qualifications of a kind or at a level in scarce supply."<sup>7</sup> However, only a beginning

<sup>7</sup> Report of the (U.S.) Committee on Federal Employment to the President's Commission on the Status of Women (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 28.

**TABLE 4-7**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON SPECIAL LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	None		1-2		3-5		6 or More		Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males		Females		Males	Females
									No.	%	No.	%		
Per Cent of Total Responding														
Professional	81.9	80.4	10.3	8.1	5.5	7.6	2.3	3.9	1,541	100.0	357	100.0	16	11
Administration A	85.5	84.1	7.9	4.5	5.5	8.0	1.1	3.4	2,595	100.0	176	100.0	1	1
Administration B and C	84.0	81.1	7.1	9.5	6.7	6.7	2.2	2.7	588	100.0	74	100.0	2	1
Technical and Inspection	79.7	76.3	13.2	13.4	5.8	7.2	1.3	3.1	2,355	100.0	321	100.0	21	2
Postal, Customs and Immigration	79.4	—	11.6	—	7.5	—	1.5	—	893	100.0	8	—	10	—
Office	75.0	76.3	72.9	11.8	8.9	8.6	3.2	3.3	5,262	100.0	11,223	100.0	84	274
Total Number	10,506	9,309	1,496	1,407	937	1,040	295	403	13,234		12,159		134	289
Per Cent Distribution	79.4	76.6	11.3	11.6	7.1	8.5	2.2	3.3						

**TABLE 4-8**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON SPECIAL LEAVE IN 1966, BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX**

Marital Status	None		1-2		3-5		6 or More		Total Responding				Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males		Females		Males	Females
									Per Cent of Total Responding					
									No.	%	No.	%		
	Single	87.1	86.3	9.6	5.8	1.6	5.8	1.7	2.1	3,291	100.0	4,983	100.0	66
Married	76.7	68.1	11.4	16.2	9.3	11.8	2.6	3.9	9,267	100.0	5,307	100.0	30	70
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	77.1	74.0	20.9	14.5	1.7	6.5	0.3	5.0	292	100.0	1,787	100.0	—	40
Marital Status Not Stated	78.8	90.2	17.5	—	3.7	9.8	—	—	382	100.0	82	100.0	40	9
Total Number	10,506	9,309	1,495	1,407	936	1,039	295	403	13,232	—	12,159	—	136	289

**TABLE 4-9**  
**SPECIAL LEAVE IN 1966 OF MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES,**  
**BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

Number of Children	Number of Days on Special Leave in 1966				Total Responding	Absence Not Stated
	None	1-2	3-5	6 Days or More		
	Per Cent of Total Responding					
None	66.5	17.1	14.4	2.0	2,253	34
1-2	68.5	16.4	10.4	4.7	2,205	4
3 Children or More	71.1	13.4	8.8	6.7	837	31
Total Number	3,602	860	627	206	5,295	69
Per Cent Distribution	68.1	16.2	11.8	3.9		
Number of Children Not Stated	11	1	1	—	13	

has been made in this direction because: "Reluctance to change attitudes and methods of operation can be overcome only by persuasion and encouragement."<sup>8</sup> The U.S. Committee on Federal Employment in its report of 1963 recommended that steps be taken "to secure changes in existing manpower utilization controls which discourage the use of part-time personnel."<sup>9</sup>

Women part-time workers have an important place in the industrial life of Canada. The percentage of employed women who work less than 35 hours a week has grown from 11.2 in 1954 to 20.9 in 1964. In Canada, approximately one worker out of five works part time; in the U.S. the proportion is about one in three. Part-time employment in Canada tends to be concentrated in a few main occupational areas: professional services, personal services, cleaning and domestic services, commercial work and clerical work.

Part-time work presents both advantages and disadvantages for employer and for employee. The main advantages for the employer are that part-time employees alleviate shortages of trained workers, and the employer who is more flexible with regard to married women may have more dependable workers. On the negative side, employment of part-time workers may present administrative difficulties such as technical factors inherent in the organization of part-time work and scheduling of hours. The principal advantages to a female employee include the possibility of keeping her professional skill up to date; addition to the family income without having to be away from her family for a full day; association with people who share her interest; and development of her career (including promotion, tenure and fringe benefits in fair proportion to those in full-time employment) until she is ready to re-enter the labour market on a full-time basis. The disadvantages to an individual of part-time employment are: the amount of time and money spent on going to work (the same for a half day as a full day); social insurance contributions, which may be quite heavy in relation to earnings if the social security coverage is to be kept up; and the fact that part-time work may not give sufficient experience, in some professions, to absorb all the changes brought about by technological progress.

Part-time employment arrangements, however, may fulfil a social as well as an economic need for the individual and for society.

*b. Preference Regarding the Length of a Working Day* — The female respondents were asked to indicate whether, if they were free to determine the length of their working day, they would prefer to work a

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 29.

full day, half day or three quarters of a day, with proportionate pay and employee benefits. It is necessary to keep in mind that their replies reflect the views of women already in the public service. The pattern of preferences might be quite different if a similar investigation were made of women not in the labour force.

Table 4-10 shows their preferences, by occupational group.

**TABLE 4-10**  
**FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' PREFERENCES REGARDING**  
**LENGTH OF WORKING DAY, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP**

Occupational Group	Preferred Length of Working Day			Total Responding	Not Stated
	Full-Day	Half-Day	Three Quarters of a Day		
	Per Cent of Total Responding				
Professional	79.1	8.7	12.2	311	57
Administration A	86.7	3.8	9.5	158	19
Administration B and C	95.7	2.9	1.4	69	6
Technical and Inspection	83.5	7.6	8.9	302	21
Office	87.4	5.5	7.1	10,728	769
Total Number	10,073	645	850	11,568	872
Per Cent Distribution	87.1	5.6	7.3		

It appears that a decisive majority of women (87.1 per cent) now in the public service prefer to work a full day. It is interesting to note, however, that among professional women one out of five would prefer to work less than a full day. One would assume that professional women, who have undergone lengthy and specialized training, would be more willing and, in a better financial position, to arrange for domestic help and child care in order to carry on in full-time employment. On the other hand, it is feasible that some professional women, if employed part time, could dispense with domestic help and be better off financially and otherwise.

Table 4-11 examines the work day preferences in relation to level of earnings.

There appears to be no precise correlation between salary level and preferences regarding the length of a working day. Obviously, women earning less than \$3,000 per year and who are economically motivated to work, have no alternative but to work a full day.

The last two tables in this section relate preferences concerning the length of a working day to marital status and to married women's family responsibilities in terms of the number of children supported by the family.

Table 4-12 shows that one out of five married women would prefer to work less than a full day. The proportion is somewhat smaller for those widowed, separated or divorced. It is interesting to note that 6 per cent of the single women would also wish to work less than a full day.

Table 4-13 gives a mixed picture. Among married women with 5 or more children, one out of four expressed a desire to work less than a full day. On the other hand, more than 90 per cent of married women with three to four children indicated a desire to work a full day.

### 3. Mobility of Employees Within the Federal Service

The variety of federal operations enables employees to transfer from one department or agency to another without loss of seniority or other employee benefits. Such an internal movement may be advantageous to an individual in broadening his or her work experience, which in turn can lead to more



**TABLE 4-11**  
**FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' PREFERRED LENGTH OF WORKING DAY,**  
**BY LEVEL OF EARNINGS**

Level of Earnings	Preferred Length of Working Day			Total Responding	Not Stated
	Full-Day	Half-Day	Three Quarters of a Day		
	Per Cent of Total Responding				
Under \$3,000	95.9	0.1	3.9	786	84
\$3,000-3,999	84.5	5.6	9.8	2,962	287
\$4,000-4,999	83.4	6.7	9.9	4,539	264
\$5,000-5,999	97.3	1.3	1.5	2,000	101
\$6,000-6,999	88.1	10.2	1.7	689	71
\$7,000 and Over	83.6	9.6	6.8	530	64
Total Number	10,035	618	849	11,503	871
Per Cent Distribution	87.1	5.6	7.3		

**TABLE 4-12**  
**FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' PREFERRED LENGTH OF WORKING DAY,**  
**BY MARITAL STATUS**

Marital Status	Preferred Length of Working Day			Total Responding	Not Stated
	Full-day	Half-day	Three quarters of a Day		
	Per Cent of Total Responding				
Single	94.0	3.2	2.8	4,392	761
Married	81.8	7.1	11.1	5,332	45
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	85.8	7.1	7.1	1,790	37
Marital Status Not Stated	86.9	—	13.1	61	30
Total Number	10,079	646	850	11,575	873
Per Cent Distribution	87.0	5.6	7.3		

**TABLE 4-13**  
**MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' PREFERRED LENGTH OF WORKING**  
**DAY, BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

Number of Children	Preferred Length of Working Day			Total Responding	Not Stated
	Full-day	Half-day	Three quarters of a Day		
	Per Cent of Total Responding				
None	83.1	8.7	8.2	2,282	5
1-2	77.8	7.5	14.7	2,173	37
3-4	92.0	0.6	7.4	702	—
5 or More Children	75.8	4.9	19.3	165	—
Total Number	4,358	374	592	5,323	42

rapid promotion. At the same time, it could be costly to the employer as time and efficiency may be lost until the replacement can take over the job satisfactorily.

The respondents were asked how many other federal departments or agencies they had worked for. The statistical data on this internal mobility of employees, by sex, occupational group and years of work in the federal service are shown in Table 4-14.

During the first five years of work, internal mobility of men and women within the federal service was almost the same. Slightly more than one quarter had worked for one or more departments other than their present one. In the Professional occupational category this proportion was about one fifth. But among the employees who had worked in federal employment for a period of six to fifteen years women had changed department or agency more often than men. Approximately one half of them did not change, compared with three fifths of the men; this pattern of mobility, with slight variations, applied to all occupational groups. The same was also true for employees who had worked for 16 to 25 years. However, among employees with 26 years of service and over, only one third of the men had never changed department or agency, compared with about half of the women. The overall internal mobility of female employees appears to be somewhat higher than that of men.

#### **4. Separations from the Public Service**

This section of the study attempts to determine the main reasons for separation — or intended separation — of men and women from federal employment and to examine in some detail how the pattern of reasons changes with such variables as age, years of work in the federal service, marital status and occupation. It also examines the reasons for withdrawal — or intended withdrawal — of some individuals from the labour market.

The statistical information used is partly from the survey and partly from files in the former Pay Research Bureau of the Civil Service Commission.

It should be emphasized that conclusions drawn from Pay Research Bureau files are on actual withdrawals, while those drawn from data gathered by the survey are on intended withdrawals only — there was no follow-up to determine whether respondents had in fact left the public service.

*a. Turnover Rates* — Table 4-15 gives the overall turnover rates in the federal service, by sex, for the calendar years 1962 to 1965. The evidence indicates that the turnover rate is almost twice as high for female employees as for male. Variations occur between different age groups and occupations.

Appendix 4-7 shows separations by reason and sex for a period of four years, 1962 to 1965. It appears that the principal reasons given by men included employment outside the federal service, voluntary and involuntary retirement, full-time educational studies, move to another locality, and ill health. The main reasons given by women were marriage, maternity, full-time home responsibilities, retirement, full-time educational studies and ill health.

While the overall turnover rate of female public employees is considerably higher than for men, it varies somewhat within specific occupations and between occupations. Appendix 4-8 illustrates turnover rates in selected occupations, by sex, in 1965. For male public employees the higher turnover rates were in the following occupations: cleaning service, typist, assessor, stationary engineer, clerk, stenographer, bookkeeping, calculating and duplicating equipment operator and electronic data processor, and postal clerk. For female employees the following occupations showed the more significant turnover rates: nurse, typist, stenographer, professional, clerk, bookkeeping, calculating and duplicating equipment operator and electronic data processor, and postal clerk.

The margin of difference in turnover rates for men and for women was smaller than the difference in the overall turnover rates in the following occupations: clerk, bookkeeping, calculating and duplicating equipment operator and electronic data processor, technical officer and administrative officer.

**TABLE 4-14**  
**NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS OR AGENCIES WORKED FOR, BY YEARS OF WORK IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE,**  
**OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group and Sex		Years of Work in the Public Service of Canada																					
		5 Years or Less				6-15				16-25				26 Years and Over				Not Sub- Stated	Total				
		1		2-3		4 or More		1		2-3		4 or More		1		2-3				4 or Other			
		No Other				Sub- Total	No Other				Sub- Total	No Other				Sub- Total	No Other						Sub- Total
		Per Cent of Total Responding																					
Professional —	Males	83.7	12.6	2.7	1.0	620	59.6	27.1	13.1	0.2	512	57.1	26.7	13.7	2.5	322	47.5	32.3	16.2	4.0	99	4	1 557
	Females	81.9	16.4	0.6	1.1	177	54.9	29.7	13.2	2.2	91	52.4	27.9	14.8	4.9	61	23.5	35.3	41.2	—	34	5	368
Administration A, B and C —	Males	70.3	25.2	4.5	—	771	42.5	35.3	18.2	4.0	779	45.7	31.4	19.1	3.8	1 034	28.6	30.8	36.2	4.4	597	6	3 187
	Females	62.7	31.4	5.9	—	51	40.0	37.8	15.5	6.7	45	38.4	24.4	32.5	4.7	86	46.2	35.4	13.8	4.6	65	5	252
Technical and Inspection —	Males	74.5	21.0	4.2	0.3	757	64.6	24.0	11.3	0.1	943	57.7	23.1	18.8	0.4	579	73.3	11.7	13.3	1.7	60	37	2 376
	Females	74.5	20.4	4.4	0.7	137	62.6	27.6	8.9	0.9	123	51.1	31.9	17.0	—	47	50.0	28.6	21.4	—	14	2	323
Postal, Customs and Immigration —	Males	48.4	36.6	13.2	1.8	227	59.9	29.9	8.7	1.5	334	46.8	38.9	9.4	4.9	265	74.0	19.2	6.8	—	73	4	903
	Females	66.7	16.6	16.6	—	6	100.0	—	—	—	1	100.0	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Office	Males	68.5	20.7	10.8	—	1 762	66.8	17.4	13.9	1.9	2 113	54.2	33.6	7.3	4.9	947	37.3	58.1	2.5	2.1	365	158	5 345
	Females	70.8	25.3	3.1	0.8	3 781	53.6	26.5	16.9	3.0	4 392	45.4	27.8	24.6	2.2	1 979	48.9	18.4	19.1	13.1	1 133	212	11 497
Total —	Males	71.2	21.3	7.3	0.2	4 135	61.0	23.7	13.7	1.6	4 681	51.7	30.8	14.1	3.4	3 147	37.9	37.6	21.2	3.3	1 194	209	13 368
	Females	71.3	24.8	3.1	0.8	4 152	53.8	26.7	16.6	2.9	4 652	45.5	27.7	24.4	2.4	2 174	48.1	20.3	19.4	12.2	1 246	224	12 448

**TABLE 4-15**  
**TURNOVER RATES OF EMPLOYEES IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE**  
**OF CANADA, BY SEX, 1962 TO 1965**

Year	Number of Employees Under the Civil Service Act		Separations			
			Males		Females	
			Number	Turnover Rate %	Number	Turnover Rate %
1962	100,062	37,236	9,535	9.5	6,579	17.6
1963	99,970	36,007	7,863	7.9	5,347	14.9
1964	100,085	37,207	7,556	7.5	5,606	15.1
1965	105,353	39,828	8,413	8.0	6,133	15.4

Source: Pay Research Bureau, The Civil Service Commission.

While the turnover rates for both sexes of the Professional group as a whole were approximately the same as the rates for the whole federal public service, there were some significant differences within Professional occupations. This may be important in view of experienced shortages of more highly-trained manpower in Canada. It may also suggest that the federal government's recruitment and employment policies, with respect to university graduates, should be directed toward attracting more women, particularly into those professional occupations which hitherto have been considered predominantly male occupations. This would minimize the wasteful turnover. An American study shows that the turnover rate for middle-aged women is lower than that for younger men. It suggests that "... in staffing certain positions where it is desirable to minimize turnover, well-qualified women in the middle age ranges could be expected to be better employment risks than younger men insofar as turnover is concerned."<sup>10</sup>

Appendix 4-9 shows the turnover rates of professional occupations, by sex, in 1965. The relatively high turnover rates among men were in the following occupations: professors (armed forces), dental officers, pharmacists, architects, patent examiners and bacteriologists. Among female employees the following professions showed more significant turnover rates: medical officers, dietitians, nutritionists and home economists, chemists, junior executive officers and social workers.

*b. Frequency of Separation* — The public employees surveyed in 1967 were asked to indicate how many times they had left the federal service for any reason (exclusive of leave without pay) for a period of six months or more since their commencement in the federal service. This frequency of separation is shown in Table 4-16 by sex, marital status, occupational category, and years of work in the federal service.

In general, the frequency of separation is higher the longer the employment in the federal service. Married men tend to have greater stability or continuity in employment and had a lower frequency of separation than single men (including widowed, separated or divorced).

Single women (including widowed, separated or divorced) show about the same pattern of frequency of separation as single men. Both single men and women left the service less often than did married women. Among married women working 6 to 15 years one third left the service once or more, and of those working 16 to 25 years, about half left the service once or more.<sup>11</sup>

Married women in the Professional and Administration occupational categories with 6 to 15 years of service had the highest frequency of separation, but this was lower than for women in the Office category

<sup>10</sup> (U.S.) Committee on Federal Employment, . . . , p. 140.

<sup>11</sup> One must keep in mind that only since 1955 have barriers to employment of married women in the federal service been removed. Those shown as married in the 16-25 years or 26-years-and-over service brackets would very likely have married after 1955.

**TABLE 4-16**  
**FREQUENCY OF SEPARATION FROM THE FEDERAL SERVICE, BY YEARS OF WORK IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE, MARITAL STATUS, OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group and Frequency of Separation	Years of Work in the Federal Service, Sex and Marital Status																	Frequency of Separation Not Stated		
	5 Years or Less				6-15				16-25				26 Years and Over							
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females	
	Married	Others <sup>1</sup>	Married	Others <sup>1</sup>	Married	Others	Married	Others	Married	Others	Married	Others	Married	Others	Married	Others	Married	Others	Males	Females
Per Cent of Total Number																				
Professional	2.9	2.0	2.6	4.0	9.1	10.6	13.8	15.6	11.5	22.4	16.7	10.9	9.3	21.4	—	9.4				
	0.7	0.5	1.3	—	2.3	2.9	13.8	4.7	3.3	—	—	3.6	2.3	—	—	—				
	414	202	76	101	405	104	29	64	270	49	6	55	86	14	2	32	13	3		
Administration A, B and C	2.1	6.7	11.1	6.1	9.9	8.7	30.0	16.7	5.4	9.1	26.3	14.9	15.0	—	—	3.1				
	0.1	—	5.6	3.0	0.3	—	10.0	4.1	—	—	5.3	4.5	1.2	—	—	—				
	668	104	18	33	707	69	20	24	915	121	19	67	525	72	2	65	6	1		
Technical and Inspection																				
	3.0	2.1	7.6	4.2	9.9	11.4	16.4	4.4	11.9	12.4	41.2	26.7	11.7	—	14.3	—				
	0.3	—	1.5	2.7	1.3	2.7	7.2	3.0	2.7	5.4	—	—	—	—	—	—				
Total Number	427	335	66	72	764	185	55	68	452	129	17	30	60	—	7	8	24	—		
Office	1.0	0.1	7.9	4.2	4.0	0.4	22.2	17.8	17.2	1.1	38.7	19.5	25.8	3.3	17.3	6.3				
	0.3	0.4	8.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	14.6	7.3	—	45.2	20.5	4.8	—	—	0.6	—				
	301	1,418	1,517	2,323	1,400	712	2,533	1,850	810	177	764	1,274	314	90	179	952	123	108		
Total																				
	2.8	1.6	7.7	3.9	8.4	3.8	22.0	12.2	12.1	8.4	38.3	19.1	18.6	3.4	16.8	6.2				
	0.6	0.3	7.6	0.2	0.9	0.8	10.8	7.7	1.4	18.3	19.5	4.8	0.8	—	0.5	—				
Grand Total Number	1,810	2,059	1,677	2,529	3,276	1,070	2,637	2,006	2,447	476	806	1,426	985	176	190	1,057	166	112		

<sup>1</sup>Includes single, widowed, separated or divorced.



with 6 to 15 years service. One third of the married women in this latter category had left federal employment at least once during their 6 to 15 years of service. As those in the more highly skilled occupations had fewer breaks in service it appears that, for married women at least, such breaks are related to skill and education.

*c. Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service* — Respondents were asked whether they intended to leave the federal service within the next two months and, if so, to indicate the primary and secondary reasons.

Professor Frederick Herzberg, of the Western Reserve University, in his studies of motivation to work, makes a distinction between two sets of factors: first, factors which result from the work itself and from a sense of achievement and recognition, that contribute to job satisfaction and, therefore, if absent, act as reasons for leaving a job; second, other factors such as good working conditions, job security, good transportation to and from work, etc., which by themselves do not promote high job morale and, therefore, if absent, do not become reasons for leaving.

In the light of this distinction, it appears that the main reasons for leaving the federal service include the desire to improve promotional opportunities, to get into a different line of work and to obtain greater job satisfaction.

In the following analysis the reasons for intended separation are examined in relation to such variables as age, sex, marital status and broad occupational classification.

It is seen (Table 4-17) that for men under the age of 25 the main reasons for separation were "to get into a different line of work" and "more pay and better fringe benefits," in that order. For women of the same age group, the two main reasons were "to improve promotion opportunities" and "more pay and better fringe benefits." For men of 25 to 44 years "to get into a different line of work" was replaced by "lack of job satisfaction," dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices" and "promotion opportunities." For women of the same age group, the reasons were dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices" and "lack of job satisfaction."

**TABLE 4-17**  
**PRIMARY REASONS FOR LEAVING\* THE FEDERAL SERVICE**  
**BY AGE GROUP AND SEX**

Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service	Age Group					
	Under 25 Years		25-44		45 Years and Over	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total					
More pay and better fringe benefits	23.8	25.0	31.9	35.0	2.3	82.4
To improve promotion opportunities	12.5	50.0	30.4	1.0	—	—
To get into different line of work	57.5	6.2	—	—	11.3	2.9
Lack of job satisfaction	1.2	6.3	17.9	29.0	50.0	11.8
Dissatisfied with agency personnel policies and practices	5.0	6.2	17.9	33.0	36.4	2.9
Prefer different geographical location and transportation difficulties	—	6.3	1.9	2.0	—	—
Total Number Responding	80	16	207	100	35	34

\* Respondents indicated that they intended to leave the federal service within the next two months; data do not indicate number of actual separations.

For both men and women the desire to get "more pay and better fringe benefits" still remained important. After the age of 45 this last reason was significant for women only; for men it is "lack of job satisfaction" and dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices." It should be noted that the desire "to get into a different line of work" is of no significance to women. This could mean, among other things, a lack of career motivation.

Table 4-18 examines the reasons, by sex and marital status, given for intended withdrawal from federal employment.

**TABLE 4-18**  
**PRIMARY REASONS FOR LEAVING THE FEDERAL SERVICE,**  
**BY SEX AND MARITAL STATUS<sup>1</sup>**

Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service	Males		Females	
	Single	Married	Single	Married
	Per Cent of Total			
More pay and better fringe benefits	15.1	30.9	72.3	45.8
To improve promotion opportunities	11.6	27.0	17.0	1.4
To get into different line of work	53.5	—	—	1.4
Lack of job satisfaction	5.8	22.1	4.3	2.8
Dissatisfied with agency personnel policies and practices	12.8	19.3	4.3	45.8
Prefer different geographical location and transportation difficulties	1.2	0.8	2.1	2.8
Total Number Responding	86	233	47	72

<sup>1</sup>Excluding widowed, separated or divorced. See also footnote Table 4-17.

The main factor for single men is the desire "to get into a different line of work." For married men this does not play any role, but all other factors are more or less important in their expressed decisions to leave. For single women, the main reason is "more pay and better fringe benefits." This is also a factor for married women but equally important to them is dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices."

Table 4-19 shows reasons given, by broad occupational groups. Professional men say they are leaving because of "lack of job satisfaction" and dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices"; professional women because of "lack of job satisfaction." The same reasons are given by men and women in the Administration category. Both males and females in the Technical and Inspection group indicated a desire for "more pay and better fringe benefits" and "to improve promotion opportunities." A substantial proportion of men and women in the Office category wish to leave because of "more pay and better benefits," but women also indicate their dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices."

*d. Assessment of Earnings and Fringe Benefits Outside the Federal Service* — Those intending to leave the federal service for other employment were asked to indicate whether the new job they were going to would give them higher, the same, or lower remuneration compared with the federal service. Table 4-20 provides this information by sex and occupational group.

About half the men and three fifths of the women leaving federal employment stated they would be earning more than in the federal service. These proportions are somewhat higher for both men and women in Technical and Inspection, and for men in Postal, Customs and Immigration categories. Surprisingly, one quarter of the men and one third of the women did not know their future salaries.

**TABLE 4-19**  
**PRIMARY REASONS FOR LEAVING THE FEDERAL SERVICE**  
**BY SEX AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUP**

Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service	Occupational Group by Sex							
	Professional		Administration A, B and C		Technical and Inspection		Office	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total							
More pay and better fringe benefits	10.2	—	1.7	20.0	34.6	80.0	37.1	60.8
To improve promotion opportunities	15.4	—	15.0	—	23.0	20.0	28.0	7.8
To get into different line of work	2.6	20.0	—	—	6.4	—	28.0	—
Lack of job satisfaction	33.3	50.0	51.7	20.0	16.7	—	—	—
Dissatisfied with agency personnel policies and practices	35.9	10.0	31.6	40.0	16.7	—	6.9	31.4
Prefer different geographical location and transportation difficulties	2.6	20.0	—	20.0	2.6	—	—	—
Total Number Responding	39	10	60	5	78	5	143	102

**TABLE 4-20**  
**ASSESSMENT OF EARNINGS OUTSIDE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT BY THOSE**  
**LEAVING FOR ANOTHER EMPLOYER BY SEX AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUP**

Occupational Group	Assessment of Pay by Sex								Total	
	Higher Pay		Same Pay		Lower Pay		Don't Know			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Per Cent of Sub-Total									
Professional	53.5	58.3	12.0	25.0	12.0	8.3	22.5	8.3	45	12
Administration	42.6	50.0	32.8	—	14.8	33.3	9.8	16.7	61	6
Technical and Inspection	74.7	80.0	5.1	—	—	—	20.2	20.0	79	5
Postal, Customs and Immigration	71.4	—	—	—	—	—	28.6	—	14	—
Office	41.5	61.4	0.7	—	27.2	—	30.6	38.6	147	101
Total Number Responding	181	76	30	3	55	3	80	42	346	124
Per Cent Distribution	52.3	61.3	8.7	2.4	15.9	2.4	23.1	33.9		

Those leaving were also asked to assess fringe benefits such as retirement pensions, health insurance, and leave provided by the new employer compared to fringe benefits offered in the federal service. Table 4-21 gives this assessment, by sex and new employer.

It appears that about half the men and women leaving thought that fringe benefits provided by the prospective employer would be the same as those available in the federal service. Again, about one quarter of the men and one third of the women leaving did not know.

Those leaving were also asked to indicate in broad categories their new employer. Table 4-22 supplies this information by sex and occupational group.

TABLE 4-21

**ASSESSMENT OF FRINGE BENEFITS OUTSIDE FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT  
BY THOSE LEAVING, BY SEX AND NEW EMPLOYER**

New Employer	Evaluation of Fringe Benefits									
	Better		Same		Poorer		Don't Know		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Per Cent of Sub-Total									
1. Business or Industry	9.2	—	48.1	50.0	19.2	1.5	23.5	48.5	260	68
2. Provincial or Local Government	25.0	25.0	55.0	25.0	15.0	—	5.0	50.0	20	4
3. International Agency	16.7	—	83.3	—	—	100.0	—	—	6	1
4. Educational Institution	8.3	7.0	91.7	72.1	—	2.3	—	18.6	12	43
5. Self-employed	—	—	—	—	16.7	100.0	83.3	—	6	1
6. Other	—	—	19.2	20.0	30.8	40.0	50.0	40.0	26	5
Total Number Responding	31	4	157	67	62	6	80	45	330	122
Per Cent Distribution	9.4	3.3	47.6	54.9	18.8	4.9	24.2	36.9		

TABLE 4-22

**DESTINATION OF THOSE LEAVING THE FEDERAL SERVICE  
BY SEX, OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND NEW EMPLOYER**

New Employer	Occupational Group										Total	
	Professional		Administration		Technical and Inspection		Postal, Customs and Immigration		Office			
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Business or Industry	14	—	51	—	65	2	—	—	130	66	260	68
Provincial or Local Government	11	2	—	—	2	2	2	—	1	—	16	4
International Agency	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	5	—	6	1
Educational Institution	5	5	2	2	5	1	—	—	—	35	12	43
Self-Employed	—	—	—	1	5	—	—	—	1	—	6	1
Other	7	4	5	1	—	—	4	—	9	—	25	5
Total Responding	38	11	58	5	77	5	6	—	146	101	325	122

About three quarters of the men and more than half the women indicated industry or business as their new field of employment. About one third of the women, mainly from the Office category, planned to teach. Recent improvements in salaries of teachers may account for this.

*e. Withdrawal from the Labour Market* — The respondents were asked whether they intended leaving the labour market altogether within the next two months and, if so, to indicate the reasons. These are analysed in Table 4-23 in relation to sex and age.

For men under the age of 25 the only reason was "to attend school," and for the age group of 25 to 44 years about one third withdrew from the labour market for the same reason. For women of child-bearing age, pregnancy was the main reason. It is evident that most women continue to work after

marriage until pregnancy occurs. The high percentage of women leaving their job because of pregnancy suggests lack of child care facilities, the high cost of domestic help and, possibly, inadequate maternity leave provisions in the federal service. Retirement is the only reason given for withdrawal by both men and women in the older age group.

**TABLE 4-23**  
**REASONS FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM THE LABOUR MARKET**  
**BY SEX AND AGE GROUP**

Indicated Reasons for Withdrawal	Age Group					
	Under 25 Years		25-44		45 and Over	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total					
1. Marriage	-	2.0	-	-	-	-
2. Pregnancy	-	65.7	-	91.7	-	-
3. To Stay Home with Children	-	28.3	-	8.3	-	-
4. Retirement on Pension	-	-	-	-	100.0	100.0
5. To Attend School	100.0	4.0	33.3	-	-	-
6. Other	-	-	66.7	-	-	-
Total Responding	42	99	60	36	10	32



## CHAPTER V

### SOME CHARACTERISTICS AND PROBLEMS OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

This chapter is devoted almost entirely to the problems of female public employees. It begins with a section on some characteristics of women employees, particularly married women, including family responsibility and husband's income. This is followed by a review of their comments on some aspects of employment in the federal service, such as child-care facilities, on-the-job health services, pensions, and maternity leave. The last two sections consider the extent of and desire for overtime work, and of willingness to travel on official business.

#### 1. Some Characteristics of Female Public Employees

As in the Canadian labour force, so in the public service married women constitute a significant proportion of female employees. It was, therefore, thought necessary to examine them in some detail by including questions on such subjects as family responsibilities and income of husband.

*a. Marital Status and Occupational Distribution* — Table 5-1 shows the distribution of women employees by marital status and broad occupational group.

Married women accounted for 43.5 per cent of the total number in occupations surveyed in the capital area, compared with 52.5 per cent of married women in the total Canadian female labour force in 1966. Thus, federal employment of married women appears to be lagging behind the national proportion. (As previously mentioned, the fact that married women did not find a place in federal service to any extent until 1955 may account in part for this lower proportion.) Single women accounted for 41.7 per cent, and other self-supporting women (widowed, separated or divorced) for 14.8 per cent, compared with 38.7 per cent of single and 9.2 per cent of other self-supporting women in the total Canadian female labour force in 1966.

In 1961 married professional women in Canada accounted for 37.4 per cent of all female professionals (including some technical occupations). It is worth noting that there were fewer married than single or other female public employees in the Professional and Administrative categories. This suggests that for a married woman to remain in these two occupational groups requires an uninterrupted professional career involvement. Higher percentages of married female employees in the Technical-Inspection and Office categories, whose husbands possibly earn relatively lower wages, no doubt reflect to some extent economic necessity as one of the reasons that these women work.

*b. Marital Status and Age Group* — Table 5-2 shows the distribution of female public employees by age and marital status. It indicates that about 40 per cent of single female employees were below the age of 25. Between 25 and 44 the percentage of single women drops, presumably because a majority get married and leave the service.

The age distribution of married women suggests the existence of the two-phase working life cycle. They continue to work until shortly before their first child is born. Most of them then withdraw around the age of 25, but after 10 or 15 years, when their children are in school, they begin to work again.

Among other self-supporting women (widowed, separated or divorced) more than four fifths were 40 years old or over.

*c. Family Responsibilities* — The concept of "family responsibilities" of married women includes a number of functions and responsibilities in relation to husband, children and home, and to other dependents or aged parents. The extent of these responsibilities varies primarily with the age of the children.

Married and self-supporting female respondents were asked to indicate the number of children, if any, partly or wholly supported by them and/or their husbands. These data are shown in Table 5-3.

TABLE 5-1

## OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND MARITAL STATUS OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Occupational Group	Single	Married	Others <sup>1</sup>	Total Responding	Marital Status Not Stated
	Per Cent of Sub-total				
Professional	59.5	31.5	9.0	365	3
Administration A	64.6	22.3	13.1	175	2
Administration B and C	52.7	28.4	18.9	74	1
Technical and Inspection	40.8	45.2	14.0	321	2
Office	40.7	44.3	15.0	11,414	83
Total Number	5,149	5,374	1,826	12,349	91
Per Cent Distribution	41.7	43.5	14.8		

<sup>1</sup>Widowed, Separated or Divorced.

TABLE 5-2

## AGE AND MARITAL STATUS OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Age Group	Single		Married		Others <sup>1</sup>		Marital Status Not Stated
	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	No.	% of Total	
Under 20	798	15.6	129	2.4	1	—	—
20-24	1,253	24.5	777	14.4	63	3.4	31
25-29	367	7.2	584	10.9	70	3.8	7
30-34	303	5.9	424	7.9	71	3.9	14
35-39	201	3.9	654	12.2	31	1.7	1
40-44	325	6.3	831	15.5	247	13.5	—
45-54	920	18.0	1,527	28.3	738	40.5	5
55-64	948	18.5	451	8.4	577	31.7	31
65 and Over	4	0.1	1	—	29	1.5	2
Total	5,119	100.0	5,377	100.0	1,827	100.0	91
Age Not Stated	34		—		—		—

<sup>1</sup>Widowed, Separated or Divorced.

TABLE 5-3

## FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES BY MARITAL STATUS AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Number of Children	Marital Status			
	Married		Widowed, Separated or Divorced	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
None	2,287	42.6	914	53.7
One	1,175	21.9	438	25.8
Two	1,034	19.3	205	12.1
Three-Four	702	13.1	142	8.4
Five and More	165	3.1	—	—
Total	5,363	100.0	1,699	100.0
Number of Children Not Stated	14		128	

In general, female labour force participation is influenced by the number of children to be cared for. Table 5-3 shows that the percentage of married women in federal employment also decreases as the number of their children rises. More than 40 per cent of married female employees had no children. In the case of widowed, separated or divorced women, more than 50 per cent were not supporting children, 25 per cent had one child to support and the rest two or more.

Table 5-4 presents the distribution of married employees by age group and number of children supported. It is seen that the married women within the age group of 25 to 39 who had four or more children, and whose family responsibilities were heaviest, constitute a relatively small proportion of employed in this age group.

**TABLE 5-4**  
**MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES,**  
**BY AGE GROUP AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

Age Group	Number of Children						Total Responding
	None	1	2	3	4	5 and More	
	Per Cent of Total Responding						
Under 20	76.0	24.0	—	—	—	—	129
20-24	59.0	17.9	23.0	0.1	—	—	777
25-29	51.2	24.6	1.5	13.1	9.6	—	582
30-34	13.7	15.3	35.4	32.8	0.7	2.1	424
35-39	15.2	18.8	20.8	19.9	9.8	15.5	653
40-44	29.7	26.1	22.8	14.6	3.8	3.0	827
45-54	51.6	20.5	20.5	3.2	2.2	2.0	1,524
55-64	54.0	32.5	13.5	—	—	—	446
65 and over	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Total Number	2,287	1,175	1,034	515	187	165	5,363
Per Cent Distribution	42.6	21.9	19.3	9.6	3.5	3.1	100.0
Number of Children not Stated							14

Table 5-5 shows how the age of children has a bearing on whether or not a mother is working. The presence of pre-school children (under 6 years of age) as an important factor in labour force behaviour among married women needs no explanation. And the more children of this age the less likelihood that a mother is working. As the ages of the children increase, the chance of the mother being employed also increases.

Women employees with children under six years of age accounted for about one fifth of married public employees, while about half of those working had children of school age (6 to 18 years). This suggests that, given better child care services, more married women might be working. In the case of self-supporting women with children, only 5 per cent had pre-school children and about one third were responsible for one or more school-aged child.

Table 5-6 shows the distribution of married female public employees in 1966 by level of earnings and number of supported children in the family.

More than three quarters of married female public employees surveyed earned less than \$5,000 in 1966. The median income amounted to \$4,550. Approximately one out of five women with children to support earned more than \$5,000 compared with one out of four women with no child to support. This may suggest that married women whose working career has been interrupted by family responsibilities might have advanced somewhat less than married women with no children, as well as the fact that few married women were employed in the federal service prior to 1955. Almost half the women

**TABLE 5-5**  
**FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY MARITAL STATUS**  
**AND NUMBER AND AGE GROUP OF CHILDREN**

Age Group of Children	Marital Status	
	Married	Widowed, Separated or Divorced
	Per Cent of Total Responding	
Under 6 Years		
None	78.1	95.2
1-2	21.2	4.8
3 Children or More	0.7	—
Sub-Total	4,744	1,455
Not Stated	633	372
6 to 18 Years of Age		
None	54.4	68.7
1-2	35.7	28.2
3 Children or More	9.9	3.1
Sub-Total	4,916	1,523
Not Stated	461	304
19 Years and Over		
None	85.5	74.8
1-2	12.9	19.4
3 Children or More	1.6	5.8
Sub-Total	4,508	1,539
Not Stated	869	288

**TABLE 5-6**  
**LEVEL OF EARNINGS AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN**  
**OF MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES**

Number of Children	Per Cent of Total	Level of Earnings					Total Res- ponding	Earnings Not Stated	Median Income
		Under \$3,000	\$3,000- 3,999	\$4,000- 4,999	\$5,000- 5,999	\$6,000 and over			
	Per Cent of Total Responding								
None	42.6	1.7	32.1	40.4	18.9	6.8	2,284	3	\$4,525
1-2	41.2	4.0	22.0	52.4	17.3	4.4	2,148	61	\$4,600
3-4	13.1	12.0	35.1	35.0	16.3	1.7	701	2	\$4,200
5 Children or More	3.1	—	23.7	57.0	1.8	17.5	165	—	\$4,700
Total Number	5,364	208	1,491	2,387	919	293	5,298	66	\$4,550
Per Cent Distribution		3.9	28.1	45.1	17.3	5.5			
Number of Children Not Stated	13	—	—	3	5	5			

with three to four children earned less than \$4,000, as did one quarter of those with five children. This suggests that strong economic necessity is forcing them to work, and that interruptions in their work have resulted in lower grades and lower-paid occupations.

In examining the level of education of married women employees and the number of children (see Table 5-7), it appears that the higher the level of education of a married woman, the fewer children she has. Among women with some high school and specialized training, 17.2 per cent had three or more children, compared with 13.9 per cent of the women with a Bachelor's degree and 2.3 per cent of the women with a Master's or doctoral degree.

**TABLE 5-7**  
**LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN**  
**OF MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES**

Level of Education	Per Cent of Total	Number of Children				Total Responding	Number of Children Not Stated
		None	1-2	3-4	5 and More		
		Per Cent of Total Responding					
Elementary and Some High School	27.4	56.2	29.9	12.8	1.1	1,473	2
Some High School and Specialized Training	27.4	33.5	49.3	14.5	2.7	1,471	1
High School Graduate	34.6	41.4	41.0	13.4	4.1	1,857	3
Post-Secondary School	8.0	28.3	55.2	9.7	6.8	424	4
Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	1.8	52.1	34.0	10.6	3.3	94	2
Master's Degree or Equivalent, or Doctor's Degree	0.8	66.7	31.0	2.3	—	42	2
Total Number	5,375	2,287	2,207	702	165	5,361	14
Level of Education Not Stated	—	—	2	—	—	—	—

*d. Husband's Income in 1966* — The husband's income is another factor determining a married woman's decision to work. A woman is more likely to work when her husband's income is low. However, there is a growing tendency for married women from middle and upper income families to work, which may be due partly to improved education of women in general.

Married women respondents were asked to give the range of their husband's income in 1966. This, together with the percentage distribution of their own earnings in 1966, is shown in Table 5-8.

Among married female public employees who earned less than \$3,000 in 1966, all indicated that their husband's income in 1966 was less than \$7,000. For women whose income ranged from \$3,000 up to \$6,000, approximately one fifth stated that their husbands' income was above \$7,000, while more than half of those women whose income was over \$6,000 indicated that their husbands' income exceeded \$7,000 in 1966. Higher-income husbands appear to have higher-income wives. More than 90 per cent of married women earned less than \$6,000, and four fifths of them had husbands whose income was below \$7,000.

Table 5-9 shows the income of the husband and the number of children supported by both husband and wife. It is seen that among public employees 80 per cent of working mothers with five or more children listed the income of their husbands as less than \$5,000. Almost 90 per cent of working mothers with three or four children listed the husband's income as less than \$7,000.

## 2. Comments on Federal Service Employment

Women employees surveyed were asked to make general comments about any issues of interest related to their employment in the public service of Canada. Approximately one in three expressed their



**TABLE 5-8**  
**MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEE'S AND HUSBAND'S INCOMES**

Married Female Public Employees' Income	Per Cent of Total Number of Married Female Employees	Husband's Income in 1966								Total Responding		Husband's Income Not Stated
		Under \$3,000	\$3,000- 3,999	\$4,000- 4,999	\$5,000- 5,999	\$6,000- 6,999	\$7,000- 7,999	\$8,000- 8,999	\$9,000- and over	No.	%	
		Per Cent of Total Responding										
Under \$3,000	3.8	3.9	41.8	13.5	13.9	26.9	—	—	—	208	100.0	—
\$3,000-3,999	28.1	9.5	9.6	19.4	31.7	13.6	7.0	6.7	2.5	1,426	100.0	65
\$4,000-4,999	45.0	8.3	11.4	19.0	24.4	18.2	8.4	6.9	3.4	2,323	100.0	66
\$5,000-5,999	17.4	4.4	8.1	11.0	32.6	23.6	5.3	10.7	4.4	912	100.0	12
\$6,000-6,999	3.3	20.2	16.7	3.6	1.2	5.4	8.3	1.8	42.9	168	100.0	5
\$7,000 and Over	2.4	8.4	2.5	1.7	16.0	17.6	13.4	7.6	32.8	119	100.0	7
Total Number	5,311	420	593	854	1,366	918	373	366	266	5,156		155
Income Not Stated	66	—	1	1	61	1	—	1	1			

**TABLE 5-9**  
**MARRIED FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY HUSBAND'S INCOME IN 1966 AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

Number of Children	Husband's Income in 1966							Total Responding	Husband's Income Not Stated	Median Income	
	Under \$3,000	\$3,000-3,999	\$4,000-4,999	\$5,000-5,999	\$6,000-6,999	\$7,000-7,999	\$8,000-8,999				\$9,000 and Over
	Per Cent of Total Responding										
None	11.0	18.8	14.2	22.3	9.0	11.3	6.9	6.5	2,247	40	\$5,275
1-2	6.8	5.2	16.5	33.6	21.6	4.6	8.0	3.7	2,102	107	\$5,650
3-4	0.3	4.0	20.9	25.5	37.2	0.4	5.9	5.8	701	1	\$5,975
5 Children and Over	21.6	25.2	32.1	7.5	—	12.8	—	0.7	134	31	\$4,100
Total Number	419	594	855	1,395	919	371	366	265	5,184	179	
Per Cent Distribution	8.1	11.4	16.5	26.8	17.7	7.4	7.1	5.2			
Number of Children Not Stated	1	—	—	5	—	4	1	3	14		

views, complaints and suggestions. While these comments do not lend themselves to statistical analysis, Appendix 5-1 shows frequency of comments by nature of the problem raised and marital status. The relevant question, number 44 in the questionnaire, was worded as follows:

Are there any things which you feel should be changed in order to enable women in the federal service to make a better contribution, or to improve their position, or to obtain more satisfaction from their work? (For example, on-the-job health care provisions, maternity leave practices, community child care facilities, promotional opportunities, superannuation provisions, etc., etc.).  
Give your comments below.

Since this was an open question, it was to be expected that some comments went beyond the subjects suggested. The summary below deals only with those subjects which had a relatively high frequency. Problems concerning part-time employment and training opportunities are discussed elsewhere.

*a. Community Child Care Facilities* — The main suggestion under this heading was for expanded facilities for community child care centres and nursery schools. Some of the single women not only advanced this suggestion on behalf of their married co-workers, but also mentioned a similar need for caring for aged parents and, in particular, the need for visiting homemaker services at a reasonable cost. A number of the respondents felt the government, as the leading employer, should be involved in encouraging municipal action to develop child care facilities or, more directly, the government itself should provide such facilities adjacent to large government buildings. Others suggested that the expenses of child care borne by working mothers should be subject to a deduction for income tax purposes.

The following excerpts from replies may be considered as characteristic or interesting, but not necessarily representative:

The availability of child day care services, says one female employee, would make her work at the office "more enjoyable" and she "would probably be able to do much better work" and would take away "a feeling of guilt about leaving the children."

Another, a sole supporter of three children, remarked: "Heaven only knows how many working days are lost to the Civil Service because some unreliable baby sitter failed to show up in the morning." She also expressed a view that the expenses of a housekeeper for working married mothers should be deductible from income tax, based on the family's joint income.

A professional woman observed: "It is ridiculous to-day to tell highly-skilled and professionally-trained women that they must sit at home when there is a shortage of workers in their respective fields." She added that, if child care facilities were available, married women would not need to withdraw from the labour market and "thus would not require extensive retraining to up-date their knowledge at the point when they re-enter the labour force."

Another woman, arguing for government-operated child care centres in places where a large number of female public employees are employed, said that such an arrangement would be convenient for her because she would take her children "to work with her and drop them off before proceeding to the office."

And, finally, a mother of two children remarked that child day care facilities are necessary "if mothers who wish to continue working are to do so without serious detriment to their functions both in and outside the home. A mother who attempts to work while worried about inadequate home care for her children is obviously at a tremendous disadvantage on both points. The resultant reduction in mental and physical well-being will certainly affect both her work output and her ability to continue working."

*b. Promotional Opportunities* — A substantial majority of those who commented on promotional opportunities felt there was discrimination, based on sex, which prevented women from obtaining higher paid or more responsible positions. This view was expressed more strongly by the single and other self-supporting women, but about one third of the married respondents commenting on this subject also held

the same view. Most of the former had been in the public service for a longer period, whereas those married women who believe sex discrimination exists have had shorter service, possibly reflecting breaks in service while raising a family and the fact that married women were not permanently employed in the federal service until some years after the Second World War.

Quite a number of women expressed frustration about the "dead end" nature of their jobs. They commented that more government-sponsored training programs would enable women to obtain better jobs. The need for training as a means of career development was voiced by both single and married women, some of the older married women making special reference to the need for "refresher" courses upon re-entry into the work force.

The following quotations illustrate the above points:

One woman stated that "the mind and ability should be judged and assessed properly — not the sex."

A university graduate stated that she had been given a position as a stenographer and there is "a definite prejudice against women occupying higher positions in the Civil Service."

Another university-trained woman remarked that the difficulty arises in "persuading management to appoint women to jobs not hitherto held by women."

A woman clerk noted that: "In the senior secretarial and clerical categories, there are insufficient opportunities for promotion and it is very difficult to find suitable positions in other lines of work."

On the problem of finding satisfaction in work, one respondent observed: "In most cases women are not given variety in their daily work, each being assigned one particular job which may take days or weeks without any change. If she is a versatile person she finds this situation monotonous, but given a slight variation in the routine, more interest and enthusiasm are created, thus enabling her to make a better contribution in the performance of her basic duties."

Concerning the Civil Service Commission's posters one female employee suggested: "In cases where positions advertised must be filled by men only, the poster should say so." She also offered a list of advice to the male members of an examination board, one item being that they should have "an open mind on the subject," i.e., on employment of women. She suggested existence of another form of discrimination "that prevails in the assessment of the functions of female workers," i.e., "such functions have been, and continue to be, minimized."

Another quotation states: "A man who shows potential in certain areas is immediately spotted and groomed for advancement. A woman is left doing the routine duties on the ground that this is a 'woman's role' and if she does a good job she is rewarded by being allowed to remain in the routine job ad infinitum."

A woman economist states that her director-general "advised me frankly that there is no place for women in senior positions."

A final quotation: "Promotion opportunities are slim for women once they have reached a certain level."

*c. On-the-job Health Care Provisions* — The views and complaints of women on health care facilities and services provided by the government were obviously influenced by the department or agency in which they were employed, reflecting the physical limitations of some of the smaller buildings in which these departments or agencies were housed, or the contrasts between old and modern buildings.

Suggestions for improvement in on-the-job health care facilities and in women's rest rooms came from employees in 19 departments. The Department of National Defence came in for twice as many complaints as any other department, no doubt due to the fact a large number of employees were still working in temporary wartime buildings, where both facilities and maintenance of rest rooms are much below standard in comparison with those in new buildings. However, there was also a fair sprinkling of complaints voiced

by female employees in locations of the departments of Secretary of State, Energy, Mines and Resources, Finance, National Health and Welfare, Defence Production, Unemployment Insurance Commission, Veterans Affairs, Manpower and Immigration and the Registrar General's office.

Almost half the comments concerned the lack of adequate rest-room facilities, particularly couches, and less than satisfactory standards of cleanliness in restrooms and washrooms.

The suggestions for improved health care services ranged from provision of first aid kits (apparently not available in some locations) to full-scale health units such as are provided by some departments, with nurses in attendance, either full or part time.

Annual physical examinations provided by the government (presumably either at health unit locations or through the group medical services plan) were proposed by a small number of women in occupations connected with health care provision or laboratories.

The following comments by women respondents may be cited:

Improved on-the-job health care provisions could include "a regular inoculation program" and "regular tubercular tests," and "additional sanitary equipment in the women's washrooms would be an asset."

"In 12 years, I have not been examined by a Civil Service Health Service doctor." This respondent added: "I have worked in several buildings, temporary and permanent, which were too hot or too cold or had faulty air conditioning, which interfered with work production."

A chemical technician wrote that the nursing office is too far from the place of work and despite hazardous toxic substances to which she is exposed "there is no regular health care available."

Another woman reported that in her place of work "there is not even a private room with a couch to which any female may retire to rest. . ." She added: "A small first aid kit is available and that is the general extent of health care available."

A practical suggestion was made by another woman who said: "Lost time through sickness would be reduced if a more practical medical and nursing care program could be introduced to ensure that immediate treatment is given to employees." She added that a qualified nurse seemed to be engaged in "record keeping and dispensing a few aspirins." She also suggested that "annual medical check-ups for employees with ten or more years of service would prevent extended leaves of absence. . ."

The year 1966 marked the twentieth year of operation of the Civil Service Health Division of the Department of National Health and Welfare, which was established to promote and conserve the health of civil servants and other federal government employees.

In 1966 the Ottawa Bureau of Medical Services comprised about 29 health units, four on a part-time basis, and all located in various government buildings. Total employees supervised by these units amounted to more than 40,000. The establishment consisted of seven medical officers (including a psychiatrist), a psychologist, a consultant in social services, a supervisor and assistant supervisor or nursing counsellors, 43 nursing counsellors and 30 auxiliary personnel. A medical centre combining administrative headquarters and clinical facilities is also established in Ottawa, which provides a diagnostic and advisory service, on an out-patient basis, to the whole government employee population in the capital. Treatment at the medical centre is confined to emergency medical and surgical conditions of a minor nature, and is not intended to substitute for the services of the practising physicians in the community.

The Ottawa Bureau of Medical Services analyses all medical certificates of disability for sick leave or retirement. Statistics are maintained on mortality and health education, and medical examinations of public employees are made when required. Routine medical examinations for permanent appointments were discontinued in 1954.



The health units operated by nursing counsellors are designed to function under supervision from the medical centre. Varying in size, these have been established on a departmental basis, wherever an employee force of approximately 750 to 1,000 or more is concentrated in one building or within an adjacent area. Basically, a health unit consists of a waiting room, treatment room, office, and restroom. Nursing counsellors give first aid, advise on improvement in working conditions, and promote health through health teaching, counselling and referral.

According to the bureau's files, nearly 180,000 visits were made to the health units in the Ottawa-Hull area in 1965. Approximately 51 per cent of these were made by male public employees and the remainder by females. During the same year the ratio of male to female public employees in this area was six to four, so that it appears that women make greater use of the services of health units. While it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of these health units, it may be pointed out that about 97 per cent of employees visiting the nursing counsellors were returned to work after medical attention or consultation at the health units. On the other hand, each health unit operating on a full-time basis (counting two part-time units as one full-time health unit) provided services for 6,600 visiting patients. This figure approximates the annual patient-visit load of general practitioners in Canada,<sup>1</sup> but the practitioners work longer hours.

*d. Superannuation Policies* — Insurance against the future is an important factor for both men and women in remaining with an employer. However, it appears from some of the comments made by female employees on this subject that the complexities of the federal government's pension plan are not fully understood.

The Public Service Superannuation Act provides that a contributor during his tenure in the public service must contribute 6 1/2 per cent if male (5 per cent if female) of his monthly salary, with the government, as employer, committed to a like expenditure (or more in order to meet pension costs). The normal retirement age is 65 for both men and women.

The monthly benefit on retirement is related to earnings, i.e., it is based on a formula of 2 per cent of average annual earnings over the highest six-year salary period, times years of service, up to a maximum of 35 years. (This length of service is also a ceiling for employee contributions to the fund.) Employees may retire at 60 without reduction in the benefit formula, but if retirement at an earlier age than 60 is approved, the benefit is actuarially reduced.

The only difference in superannuation provisions for men and women in the federal service, apart from the contribution rate, is that women cannot name survivors for benefits. The pamphlet "Your Superannuation Plan," issued to federal public employees, states on page 12: "There is no provision for payment of annuity benefits in respect of the husband if the wife was a contributor before her death." In this case it appears that widowers are at a disadvantage compared to widows.

About one-third of the women commenting on superannuation problems said they would like to be able to designate husbands (in the case of single women, other dependents were suggested) for survivor benefits, even if contribution rates had to be increased. Some women thought that if the rates of contribution for men and women were the same there would be higher pension benefits for women; such is not the case in this type of plan.

One in three of the commentators suggested that retirement be permitted at an earlier age — 55 was mentioned, or after 35 years of service — and, presumably, the intent was that such earlier retirement should not result in a reduced benefit formula, as it does at present.

*e. Maternity Leave Provisions* — The problems of married female public employees gave rise to suggestions concerning changes in present maternity leave policies of the federal government.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stanislaw Judek, *Medical Manpower in Canada* (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1964), p. 180.



The I.L.O. Conventions and Recommendations on Maternity Protection emphasize “not simply the protection of working mothers from exploitation and loss of income because of maternity” but the need to help married women “to combine their dual responsibilities as family members and as members of the labour force.”<sup>2</sup> In Canada, legislation to ensure protection of the health and job security of women workers before and after child birth exists in British Columbia and New Brunswick. Legislation in Alberta and Ontario gives authority to the Board of Industrial Relations and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, respectively, to deal by regulation with the problems of maternity protection, but no such regulations have been issued.

There are statutory provisions for maternity leave in federal public service regulations, and in the majority of provincial Civil Service jurisdictions, as well as in personnel policies of several crown corporations. Business and industry in Canada also provide maternity leave in some cases. In general, however, a relatively small number of collective agreements make provision for maternity leave. In a 1965 survey of 97 establishments, with a total of 164,000 employees of whom more than 53,000 (or 32 per cent) were women, more than 40,000 of the women in the survey were granted maternity leave of varying duration as a result of management decision rather than by collective agreements.<sup>3</sup>

As far as the federal service is concerned, up until the Second World War married women who were not self-supporting were employed only in special circumstances and, therefore, the problem of maternity leave was irrelevant. With an influx of married women into the public service during the war and after, a maternity leave policy was introduced. But a married woman still had to resign at least two months before the birth of her child, although she retained her right to re-employment upon presentation of a medical certificate that the child no longer needed the mother’s personal care.<sup>4</sup>

When the war emergency was over, the regulation requiring a woman to resign on marriage was again enforced. Once again maternity leave became irrelevant. In 1955, however, the regulations restricting the permanent employment of married women were revoked, and maternity leave assumed importance for a growing number of women employees. But not until 1958 were new regulations enacted. These provided for maternity leave without pay, commencing two months prior to expected date of birth (unless either by a medical certificate or agreement of a department concerned the period was altered). The employee was to return within six months after the birth.<sup>5</sup>

Maternity leave privilege was not the right of a female married employee, it depended on permission from the deputy head of the department. By 1962,<sup>6</sup> however, maternity leave became an entitlement for both married and unmarried women, although still without pay. A woman is entitled to sick leave when complications in pregnancy occur during the first seven months, but she is not entitled to sick leave if complications occur during the last two months, because normally she would be expected to be on maternity leave during this period. The present regulations permit flexibility in shortening either the two months pre-natal period or post-natal period of six months, on submission of a medical certificate. There is no provision for extending the post-natal leave. It should be noted that, on return to employment, the woman is required to pay both her own share and that of the government toward the superannuation plan and the medical insurance plan in order to be reinstated without a break in benefits.

As might be expected, the majority who proposed changes in the present maternity leave policy were married women under the age of 44. Most suggestions concerned maintenance of income, in full or in

---

<sup>2</sup> Sheila Woodsworth, *Maternity Protection for Women Workers in Canada* (Ottawa, Queen’s Printer, 1967), p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>4</sup> Dorothy Cadwell, quoted in report of a consultation on Employment of Women with Family Responsibilities (Canada Department of Labour, Women’s Bureau, 1965).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Civil Service Regulations, Section 66 – Statutory Orders and Regulations, 1962.

part, during maternity leave. An alternative suggestion was that expectant women should be able to apply all their unused sick leave credits during the child-bearing period.

Some women felt that maternity leave should be extended, if necessary, beyond the six months maximum post-natal period and others argued that having to pay double contributions toward the superannuation and health plans after losing income during maternity leave was too burdensome and unjust at a time when family expenses increased.

The following comments from questionnaires enlarge on some of the above views:

A female economist wrote that the present maternity leave regulations should be broadened to include:

- (a) a subsistence allowance for the mother for three months,
- (b) coverage by the employer of his share (one-half) of the medical care insurance scheme for public servants for three months,<sup>7</sup>
- (c) continuation by the employer of his share of superannuation contributions for . . . three months . . .

Another woman stated: "It is ridiculous to expect a family to cut their income in half when children are born and the additional income is needed even more."

A young mother said: "I was really annoyed when I found I couldn't use any of my accumulated sick leave to cover my maternity leave. I was advised, off the record, not to indicate 'pregnancy' as a cause for any casual sick leave."

### 3. Overtime Work

This part of the study is concerned with the extent of overtime work by women in the public service, related to occupational group, marital status and age. Views on the desired extent of overtime work, based on experience, are also examined here.

Regulations governing the federal public service stipulate that:

Leave of absence with pay shall be granted, or compensation in lieu thereof paid, in accordance with these Regulations to an employee who works overtime where

- (a) the deputy head has required the employee to work overtime;
- (b) the employee does not control the duration of the period that he works overtime.<sup>8</sup>

The standard weekly hours of work for every employee are 37 1/2, or, where the deputy head so prescribes, 40 hours.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women stressed the importance of a deterrent (a higher rate of pay for overtime) against working hours becoming excessively long. Its Committee on Protective Labor Legislation also considered such a deterrent as desirable and stated: "The extra cost of wages tends to encourage better planning, discourages overtime work, and establishes a better standard than can practically be accomplished by laws merely setting absolute limitations on hours at a given time."<sup>9</sup> The Public Service regulations in Canada do not set a maximum limitation on overtime work per day, week or month.

---

<sup>7</sup> At present, an employee during leave without pay (which includes maternity leave) must pay his or her own and the employer's share of the medical-health plan.

<sup>8</sup> Civil Service Act, Civil Service Regulations, P.C., 1962-415, Section 13.

<sup>9</sup> Report of the Committee on Protective Labor Legislation to the President's Commission on the Status of Women (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 9.

a. *Extent of Overtime Work per Month* — Female employees were asked if they were sometimes required to work overtime (for which they receive leave or pay) and, if so, to indicate the average number of hours of overtime worked per month during the last twelve months.

Table 5-10 provides this information, by broad occupational group. It is seen that about two thirds of the female employees had no overtime work, while about a quarter were asked to work one to ten hours overtime per month, and 8 per cent more than 11 hours per month. Women in the Administration groups worked more overtime than the total proportions just indicated.

Table 5-11 relates overtime work to marital status. It is seen that self-supporting women-widowed, separated or divorced — carried the heaviest load of overtime, more than one third indicating that they worked some overtime. One out of ten worked 11 or more hours per month. About one quarter of married women worked overtime, for an average of one to five hours per month. One third of the single women also put in about one to five hours overtime per month.

**TABLE 5-10**  
**OVERTIME WORK OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP**

Occupational Group	Average Number of Hours of Overtime Work Per Month				Total Responding	Overtime Not Stated
	None	1-5	6-10	11 Hours or More		
	Per Cent of Total Responding					
Professional	69.5	13.6	6.8	10.1	295	73
Administration A	63.0	16.0	7.0	14.0	143	34
Administration B and C	55.6	19.0	7.9	17.5	63	12
Technical and Inspection	76.0	14.0	5.0	5.0	301	22
Office	68.3	19.3	4.1	8.3	10,474	1,023
Total Number	7,719	2,138	477	942	11,276	1,164
Per Cent Distribution	68.5	19.0	4.2	8.3		

**TABLE 5-11**  
**OVERTIME WORK OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY MARITAL STATUS**

Marital Status	Average Number of Hours of Overtime Work Per Month				Total Responding	Overtime Not Stated
	None	1-5	6-10	11 Hours or More		
	(Per Cent of Total Responding)					
Single	65.7	20.1	5.7	8.5	4,187	967
Married	72.5	16.0	3.6	7.9	5,264	113
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	62.1	25.7	2.1	10.1	1,772	54
Marital Status Not Stated					61	30
Total Number	7,719	2,142	477	946	11,284	1,164
Per Cent Distribution	68.4	19.0	4.2	8.4		

Table 5-12 shows the distribution of overtime work by age group. It is interesting to observe that women in the age group 30 to 39, many of whom are married, have had the heaviest load of overtime work. About half of them worked overtime compared with the one-third or one-quarter proportions for most of the other age groups. One out of ten women in the 25 to 40 age group, and one out of four in the 30 to 34 age group, put in eleven hours or more overtime per month. After the age of 40 the extent of overtime work diminishes.

*b. Desired Extent of Overtime Work per Month* — The women were also asked to indicate how many hours each month, on average, they would like to work overtime. Their preferences are examined in relation to their actual and personal experience of overtime work. This is shown in Table 5-13.

**TABLE 5-12**  
**OVERTIME WORK OF FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY AGE GROUP**

Age group	Average Number of Hours of Overtime Work Per Month				Total Responding	Overtime Not Stated
	None	1-5	6-10	11 Hours or More		
	Per Cent of Total Responding					
Under 20	91.0	7.4	1.2	0.4	862	66
20-24	61.0	26.0	8.9	4.1	1,969	155
25-29	64.3	19.2	5.3	11.2	899	129
30-34	50.7	15.8	8.5	25.0	740	72
35-39	51.1	32.3	5.6	11.0	800	87
40-44	79.3	7.4	1.5	11.8	1,330	71
45-54	69.1	20.8	2.5	7.6	2,952	239
55-64	74.8	16.4	2.4	6.4	1,666	342
65 and over	97.1	—	2.9	—	34	2
Age Not Stated					33	1
Total Number	7,719	2,142	477	946	11,284	1,164
Per Cent Distribution	68.4	19.0	4.2	8.4		

**TABLE 5-13**  
**FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' VIEWS ON DESIRED EXTENT OF OVERTIME WORK  
RELATED TO PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF OVERTIME WORK**

Personal Experience of Overtime Work		Desired Extent of Overtime in Hours per Month				No View Stated
Average Number of Hours of Overtime Work	Total Responding	None	1-5	6-10	11 Hours or More	
		Per Cent of Total Responding				
None	7,261	73.9	12.4	7.1	6.6	458
1-5	2,102	43.3	46.3	9.1	1.3	40
6-10	442	47.1	25.6	23.1	4.3	35
11 hours or more	840	29.2	7.4	27.0	36.4	106
Total Number	10,645	6,731	2,046	1,036	832	639
Per Cent Distribution		63.2	19.2	9.7	7.8	
Overtime Not Stated	1,164					

Among women with no overtime work experience — and these accounted for almost 60 per cent of the total female public employees surveyed — three quarters did not want any overtime. Among those who had averaged one to five hours of overtime per month, less than half did not want overtime. This also applied to those who had averaged six to ten hours of overtime. One third of those who had averaged eleven hours or more overtime per month did not want overtime work.

On the whole, 36.7 per cent of the female public employees expressed a desire to do some overtime work, compared with 31.5 per cent of women having actually worked overtime in the previous year. About 10 per cent wanted to work six to ten hours per month, compared with 4 per cent who had done so.

Table 5-14 shows, by marital status, the extent of overtime work desired. By comparing it with Table 5-11, it appears that three quarters of the married women neither work overtime nor wish to work overtime. And of those who do work some would prefer to work less than the eleven hours or more they do now. As for widowed, separated or divorced women a somewhat higher proportion would like to work overtime than now do. More of them would be prepared to work six hours and more than they are being asked to do. Single women also expressed a desire to do more overtime work, provided it is no more than ten hours per month.

**TABLE 5-14**  
**FEMALE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' VIEWS ON DESIRED EXTENT OF**  
**OVERTIME WORK, BY MARITAL STATUS**

Marital Status	Desired Extent of Overtime in Hours per Month					Not Stated
	None	1-5	6-10	11 Hours or More	Total Responding	
	Per Cent of Total Responding					
Single	54.3	26.7	11.2	7.8	4,091	1,062
Married	71.8	15.2	7.2	5.8	5,188	190
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	51.4	20.1	15.1	13.4	1,598	228
Marital Status Not Stated					59	32
Total Number	6,805	2,218	1,077	836	10,936	1,512
Per Cent Distribution	62.2	20.3	9.8	7.7		

#### 4. Travelling on Official Business

A number of positions in the federal service, usually at the administrative or higher levels, involve travelling, and the extent to which an individual is prepared to travel may be a factor in his or her career advancement.

*a. Rejection of a Position Demanding Travelling* — The respondents, both male and female, were asked if they would decline a position necessitating travel on official business. They were not asked to specify if they were qualified to compete, or would compete, for those positions requiring travel. Further, the preponderance of female employees in the Office category, where travel is seldom a requirement, should be borne in mind.

Table 5-15 provides an analysis of answers in terms of sex, age group and marital status. One quarter of the single women, compared to one eighth of single men, would decline a position requiring travel on official business. As the age of these respondents increases so does, but to a smaller degree, the number who would reject a position involving travel.



**TABLE 5-15**  
**PERCENTAGE WHO WOULD REJECT POSITION NECESSITATING TRAVELLING ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS**  
**BY SEX, AGE GROUP AND MARITAL STATUS**

Age Group	Would Decline Position That Would Necessitate Travelling on Official Business														View Not Stated
	Single						Married						Widowed, Separated or Divorced		
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females		Males	Females	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	No.	No.	
Under 25 25-44 45 and over	13.3	1,765	23.9	2,050	6.8	350	66.3	906	—	5	1.6	64	56	93	
	8.8	1,188	23.3	1,168	4.6	4,778	58.5	2,492	—	149	29.7	387	239	83	
	17.7	401	30.3	1,781	12.2	4,148	49.2	1,976	10.8	139	30.9	1,315	146	99	
Total Number Responding and Per Cent who would decline travel Age Not Stated	12.2	3,354	26.0	4,999	8.1	9,276	56.4	5,374	5.1	293	29.6	1,766	441	275	
	—	3	—	34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	

More than half the married women, and two thirds in the youngest age group, would decline a position requiring travel. Among married men and those widowed, separated or divorced, only a small proportion would decline to travel, the highest proportion being one out of eight in the married age group 45 and over, and one out of ten in this age group among the others. Almost one third of the widowed, separated or divorced women would decline a position involving travel, again reflecting home responsibilities.

*b. Attitudes toward Extent of Travel* — Those who were prepared to travel on official business were then asked to specify the extent of travel that they were prepared to undertake. This is set out in Appendix 5-2, which indicates the degree of travel, from an occasional day outside the city to unlimited trips, which those who would undertake travel favoured, by age group, sex and marital status of the respondents.

It is seen from this appendix that regardless of age, between 40 and 50 per cent of the single women were willing to travel frequently or without limitations, as were similar proportions of single men.

On the other hand, from 50 to 60 per cent of the married men would not wish to make more than an occasional trip, compared to more than 80 per cent of married women. Among the widowed, separated or divorced women, only those 45 years or over were prepared to travel frequently. This probably reflects the heavier family responsibilities which women carry. If the married women respondents were otherwise qualified to accept positions in the federal service, this reluctance to travel would be a factor in retarding their careers.

## CHAPTER VI

### SOURCES OF RECRUITMENT

This chapter deals with the sources from which public employees are recruited. The first section examines the type and duration of previous employment experience of public employees prior to entering the federal service. It also includes the relationship, if any, between previous occupations and their present position in federal employment. This is followed by a brief section on foreign-born public employees. And the last section concerns recruitment of university graduates.

#### 1. Previous Work Experience

a. *Former Employer* — The respondents were asked, if they were employed prior to their present position in the federal service, for length of service with, and type of activity of, their last employer before entering government service.

This information is given in Table 6-1 by sex and occupational group.

About three quarters of the male employees, compared to three fifths of the female, had some previous work experience prior to joining the federal service. These proportions vary somewhat between different occupational groups. For example, almost nine out of ten men in the Administration category were working just before entering federal employment.

More than half the male employees with previous work experience came from business or industry, one quarter from the Armed Forces (war veterans, who enjoyed priority in federal service employment), and the remainder from unspecified employers, educational institutions, provincial and local government, self-employment and international agencies in that order. As for female employees, three fifths came from business and industry, one eighth from unspecified employers, one tenth from educational institutions, and the rest from provincial and local government, the Armed Forces, self-employment and international agencies in that order.

Most of the males in the Professional category with previous work experience came from business or industry, educational institutions and the Armed Forces after ten years or less of previous work experience, while females in that category came mainly from educational institutions, business or industry, and the provincial and local government sector. Among men in the Administration category about half came from business or industry and one third from the Armed Forces after ten years or less of work experience, while women in that category came principally from business or industry, educational institutions, and provincial or local government.

Three fifths of the males and about half the females in the Technical and Inspection occupational group had work experience in business and industry, and one quarter of the men came from the Armed Forces, while women technicians came from educational institutions and provincial or local governments.

Finally, among those with previous work experience in the Office occupational group, about three fifths of both men and women came from business and industry, one quarter of the men from the Armed Forces and almost one tenth of the women from educational institutions.

b. *Relationship between Last Occupation and Present Position* — In order to establish a positive relationship between present job and previous work experience, the respondents were also asked if their last occupation was related to their current work in the federal service. This relationship is shown in Table 6-2.

Among the employees who had work experience just before their present position in federal employment, about one third of both men and women stated that their last occupation was related to their current job. This relationship was most evident among Professional category employees and least evident in the Postal, Customs and Immigration groups, though only one fifth of the men in the Office category had had previous employment with direct relationship.

**TABLE 6-1**  
**CATEGORY OF LAST EMPLOYER AND YEARS OF PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	Years of Work With Previous Employer	Type of Previous Employer												Total With Previous Work Experience		Category of Employer Not Stated		No Previous Experience		Total	
		International Agency		Provincial or Local Government		Business or Industry		Educational Institution		Armed Forces		Self-employed		Other		Previous Work Experience		Employer Not Stated			
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		
Professional	2 years or less	43.8	85.7	40.2	36.2	46.3	43.1	56.8	49.3	16.8	33.3	17.5	30.0	35.6	46.0						
	3 to 10 years	53.1	14.3	48.7	55.3	49.0	51.0	37.5	45.1	72.3	66.7	50.0	50.6	41.3							
	11 years and over	3.1	—	11.1	8.5	8.8	5.9	5.7	5.6	10.9	—	32.5	20.0	13.8	12.7						
	Sub-total	32	7	117	47	492	51	192	71	155	9	40	10	160	63	1,188	258	9	3	360	107
	Per Cent of Total With Previous Work Experience	2.7	2.7	9.8	18.2	41.4	19.7	16.2	27.6	13.0	3.5	3.4	3.9	13.5	24.4	100.0	100.0				
Administration A and B and C	2 years or less	40.0	57.1	29.9	47.1	35.8	50.6	61.0	50.0	7.1	16.7	43.1	33.3	58.1	35.0						
	3 to 10 years	60.0	42.9	34.5	52.9	49.1	41.8	19.5	50.0	71.4	66.6	50.8	66.7	33.6	60.0						
	11 years or more	—	—	35.6	—	15.1	7.6	19.5	—	21.5	16.7	6.1	—	8.3	5.0						
	Sub-total	15	7	87	17	1,400	79	123	36	801	6	65	3	265	20	2,756	168	6	1	425	83
	Per Cent of Total With Previous Work Experience	.5	4.2	3.2	10.1	50.7	47.0	4.5	21.4	29.1	3.6	2.4	1.8	9.6	11.9	100.0	100.0				
Technical and Inspection	2 years or less	70.6	75.0	71.1	40.0	54.1	45.8	48.1	44.0	7.9	37.5	48.1	50.0	60.9	52.2						
	3 to 10 years	29.4	25.0	28.9	60.0	39.3	45.8	51.9	44.0	71.6	62.5	39.5	37.5	23.9	43.5						
	11 years or more	—	—	—	—	6.6	8.4	—	12.0	20.5	—	12.4	12.5	15.2	4.3						
	Sub-total	17	4	45	25	1,097	96	27	25	405	8	81	8	92	46	1,764	212	10	3	602	108
	Per Cent of Total With Previous Work Experience	1.0	1.9	2.6	11.8	62.1	45.3	1.5	11.8	23.0	3.8	4.6	3.8	5.2	21.6	100.0	100.0				
Postal, Customs and Immigration	2 years or less	—	—	42.9	100.0	43.7	50.0	40.0	—	9.0	—	52.6	—	46.2	—						
	3 to 10 years	—	—	57.1	—	45.8	50.0	60.0	—	75.4	100.0	47.4	—	47.3	—						
	11 years or more	—	—	—	—	10.5	—	—	—	15.6	—	—	—	6.5	—						
	Sub-total	—	—	42	1	373	2	15	—	199	1	38	—	93	—	760	4	9	—	134	4
	Per Cent of Total With Previous Work Experience	—	—	5.5	25.0	49.1	50.0	2.0	—	26.2	25.0	5.0	—	12.2	—	100.0	100.0				
Office	2 years or less	93.2	48.7	93.5	46.2	66.7	55.4	36.2	20.6	6.4	30.8	90.8	75.4	97.0	39.4						
	3 to 10 years	6.8	51.3	3.7	47.1	24.7	36.8	63.0	55.1	57.0	62.5	9.2	24.6	2.6	54.3						
	11 years or more	—	—	2.8	6.7	8.6	7.8	8	24.3	36.6	6.7	—	—	.4	6.3						
	Sub-total	44	76	107	433	2,012	4,210	127	577	749	208	98	236	230	906	3,367	6,646	129	122	1,849	4,729
	Per Cent of Total With Previous Work Experience	1.3	1.1	3.2	6.5	59.8	63.4	3.8	8.7	22.2	3.1	2.9	3.6	5.8	13.6	100.0	100.0				

TABLE 6-2

PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES WHOSE OCCUPATION WITH LAST EMPLOYER WAS RELATED TO PRESENT POSITION IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX

Occupational Group	Per Cent of Total Responding Whose Last Occupation was Related to Present Position in the Federal Service		Total Responding		Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Professional	57.2	67.8	1,204	267	353	101
Administration A, B and C	51.5	45.4	2,799	174	388	78
Technical and Inspection	54.3	44.6	1,755	224	621	99
Postal, Customs and Immigration Office	12.0	25.0	775	4	128	4
	20.1	36.1	3,467	6,784	1,878	4,713
Total Number	3,875	2,813	10,000	7,453	3,368	4,995
Per Cent of Distribution	38.8	37.8				

## 2. Immigrant Public Employees

The Civil Service Regulations stipulate that Canadian citizens take precedence over non-Canadians on eligible lists for appointment, but there is no regulation stipulating Canadian citizenship as a prerequisite to appointment. It takes five years of residence in Canada to become a naturalized Canadian subject. In general then, there is a five-year interval before immigrants can overcome the precedence rule and successfully compete for federal employment. Some exceptions to this general rule have been and are being made, particularly in occupations where shortages of skilled manpower exist. There are certain departments, for example External Affairs, from which naturalized Canadian subjects are usually excluded.

This section on immigrant public employees is limited to an analysis by time of their arrival in Canada, occupational category and level of education.

Table 6-3 shows the distribution of foreign-born public employees by sex and time of arrival in Canada. The terminal year 1961 and the early part of 1967, when the Survey of Utilization of Employees in the Public Service of Canada was conducted, allows for the five-year naturalization period referred to above.

TABLE 6-3  
FOREIGN-BORN PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, BY SEX AND  
TIME OF ARRIVAL IN CANADA

Time of Arrival in Canada	Male	Female	Total
	%	%	%
Before 1946	29.8	44.9	36.2
1946-1960	59.4	46.0	53.7
1961 and after	10.8	9.1	10.1
Total Number Responding	1,459	1,075	2,534
Per Cent Distribution	57.6	42.4	
Not Stated	80	40	120



It appears that two thirds of the immigrants among public employees surveyed in the capital area arrived in Canada after 1946. Between 1946 and 1960 approximately two million immigrants came to this country, and 52 per cent of them entered the labour force immediately upon entry. Despite the five-year lag, immigrants who came between 1946 and 1961 accounted also for 53 per cent of the total number of immigrant public employees. It appears, therefore, that, apart from what has been said previously, there are no apparent barriers to entry of immigrants into federal employment.

To assess the relative significance of immigrant public employees Tables 6-4 and 6-5 present the percentage distribution of foreign-born and Canadian-born employees by sex and occupational group.

Immigrant public employees accounted for one tenth of the total number of employees included in the survey. This proportion compares with 21.4 per cent of immigrant workers in the Canadian labour force in 1961. Male immigrant public employees accounted for 11.5 per cent of the total number of male employees in the survey, female immigrants for 9 per cent of the women employees. In 1961, the corresponding percentages of male and female immigrants in the Canadian labour force were 21.7 and 20.7 respectively.

**TABLE 6-4**  
**PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN-BORN TO TOTAL PUBLIC EMPLOYEES,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	Foreign-Born Employees			Total Number		
	Males	Females	Males and Females	Males	Females	Males and Females
	% of Total					
Professional	22.1	3.8	25.9	1,557	368	1,925
Administration A, B and C	14.8	0.9	15.6	3,187	252	3,439
Technical and Inspection	13.7	2.2	15.9	2,376	323	2,699
Postal, Customs and Immigration	4.3	0.1	4.4	903	8	911
Office	1.2	5.6	6.8	5,345	11,497	16,842
Total	1,539	1,115	2,654	13,368	12,448	26,816
Per Cent Distribution	11.5	9.0	10.3			

**TABLE 6-5**  
**FOREIGN-BORN AND CANADIAN-BORN PUBLIC EMPLOYEES,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	Foreign-Born Employees		Canadian-Born Employees	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
	%	%	%	%
Professional	27.6	6.6	9.6	2.6
Administration A, B and C	33.0	2.8	22.6	0.3
Technical and Inspection	24.1	5.4	16.9	2.4
Postal, Customs and Immigration	2.5	0.1	7.3	0.1
Office	12.8	85.1	43.5	94.6
Total	1,539	1,115	11,829	11,333

During the period 1946-1960 about one out of ten immigrants joining the Canadian labour force was in the Professional occupational category.<sup>1</sup> This proportion was about the same as the occupational composition of the Canadian labour force in 1961. Immigrants, however, accounted for one quarter of the Professional group in the survey. They also accounted for one sixth of those in the Administration and Technical-Inspection groups. All three groups contain more highly skilled occupations usually requiring a university education. This very significant contribution to the public service in Canada was made principally by male immigrants, as more than four fifths of the female immigrants were employed in the Office category. This is partly explained by a somewhat lower educational achievement of women immigrants compared with male immigrants, as is shown in Table 6-6.

**TABLE 6-6**  
**CANADIAN- AND FOREIGN-BORN PUBLIC EMPLOYEES,**  
**BY SEX AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION**

Level of Education	Canadian-Born		Foreign-Born	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Elementary and Some High School	19.6	26.7	10.3	10.7
Some High School and Specialized Training	20.8	26.3	12.4	24.9
High School Graduate	29.9	34.8	15.2	41.3
Post-Secondary School	9.5	9.1	11.5	11.1
Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent	13.5	2.3	27.1	8.7
Master's Degree or Equivalent	5.3	0.7	17.3	2.5
Doctor's Degree	1.4	0.1	6.2	0.8
Total	11,824	11,330	1,538	1,114
Educational Level Not Stated	5	3	1	1

About half the male immigrant public employees had a university level of education compared with one eighth of women immigrant employees. The male immigrants' level of education compares favourably with that of Canadian-born male public employees as only one fifth of the latter achieved university level. Similarly, 12 per cent of the female immigrants had a university education compared with 3.1 per cent of Canadian-born female employees. The differences in post-secondary school level of education between men and women of Canadian and foreign-born extraction are less significant.

### 3. Recruitment of University Graduates

The Civil Service Commission for a number of years had held competitions, open to university students in their graduating year, to fill positions in general administration, foreign service, trade and commerce, and sciences. In order to attract more and better personnel, the Commission also places university students in various departments during the summer months, hoping to arouse their interest in public service on a permanent basis.

To assess properly the entrance opportunities into public service for male and female university graduates, information was requested from the Civil Service Commission on the number of applicants, the number of candidates tested or having written examinations, called for interview, failed at interview, offered employment, and actual appointments. This information was requested for the past few years, but unfortunately it was not possible to obtain reliable (i.e. complete) figures going back beyond 1964. Consequently, only a partial analysis of recruitment of university graduates can be attempted here.

<sup>1</sup> 1961 Census data. Immigration authorities obtain information from immigrants about their "intended" occupation though, in fact, the immigrant may follow a different occupation than the one he or she indicated.

The following table provides partial information on university recruitment for two years for Junior Executive Officers and Foreign Service Officers only.

**TABLE 6-7**  
**RECRUITMENT OF UNIVERSITY GRADUATES FOR JUNIOR**  
**EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS,**  
**1961-62 and 1962-63**

Year	Sex	Number of Candidates	Per Cent Age Qualified and Accepted	
			Qualified	Accepted
1961-62	Males	1,033	23.4	9.5
	Females	234	19.8	7.7
1962-63	Males	793	23.4	8.0
	Females	262	17.1	6.1

Source: Civil Service Commission files.

**TABLE 6-8**  
**APPLICATIONS AND ELIGIBLE LIST OF UNIVERSITY GRADUATES,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL CLASS AND SEX, 1964 AND 1965**

Year	Occupational Class	Number of Applications		Eligible List	
		Males	Females	Males	Females
				Per Cent of Number of Applications	
1964	Junior Executive Officer and Foreign Service Officer	1,677	498	16.7	11.9
1965		1,601	613	29.0	26.1
1964	Electrical Engineer	123	—	14.6	—
1965		421	—	13.0	—
1964	Mechanical Engineer	64	—	14.0	—
1965		286	—	9.9	—
1964	Civil Engineer	168	—	22.6	—
1965		754	4	16.8	0
1964	Biological Sciences	347	76	7.9	7.8
1965		641	135	14.6	14.0
1964	Physical Sciences	406	28	33.0	39.9
1965		641	42	22.7	11.9
1965	Finance and Commerce	204	10	26.4	33.3

Source: Files in the Civil Service Commission.

In the fiscal year 1961-62 only 18 female university graduates were accepted and in the following year only 16.

Only in the Junior Executive Officers category do women seem to be gaining better acceptance during recent years. In 1964, 28 women, or 28 per cent of the total number, were appointed and in 1965, 39 women, or 35 per cent of the total. As a rule women have not been appointed Foreign Service Officers in the Department of Trade and Commerce, but a number are in that classification in the Department of External Affairs.

Table 6-8 provides partial information on recruitment of university graduates for various types of appointments in the public service during 1964 and 1965.

The column "applications" includes all candidates who submitted an application form and does not eliminate those who did not report for the test. The "eligible list" column represents all those who qualified for appointment and does not imply that they were accepted or did accept.

The table indicates also that only in the cases of Junior Executive Officer and Foreign Service Officer did female university graduates not do as well as male graduates. In other occupational classes female applicants advanced to an "eligible list" to the same extent as men. It is noticeable that there were no female applicants in the engineering class.

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

First, a summary will be given of findings from data set out in Chapter II pertaining to all employees in the federal service. These data were published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Findings from other chapters come from data drawn from a special survey of federal employees in the Ottawa-Hull area conducted in 1967, and from data provided by the Public Service Commission for the service as a whole.

#### A. Growth and Composition of Public Service Employment

##### *Growth of Federal Employment*

Between 1912 and 1966, federal employment multiplied more than eight-fold, compared with a three-fold increase in the Canadian labour force.

At the time of Confederation, women were not employed in the federal service but, by 1886, there were 24 women in public employment. Their numbers increased, particularly during the First World War, to 5,775 in 1928 and to about 8,000 in 1937. During World War II, the number of female public employees rose to approximately 50,000, but declined again after the war. Another upward trend began in the early 1950's and since 1960 about one out of four employees covered by the Civil Service Act have been women.

##### *Women's Changing Position in the Federal Service*

The reports of various Royal Commissions prior to World War I, while recognizing that female public employees were useful, efficient and, perhaps, necessary, usually indicated real and imaginary obstacles to their employment, some of which reflected male prejudice. For example, it was suggested that women should be located in rooms by themselves and should not supervise male clerks, and that women were too willing to accept lower pay. Women were in most cases appointed temporarily and to the lower grades.

While the principle of equal pay for equal work was accepted, it was seldom reflected in the grade levels obtained by women.

Female employees were forced to resign on marriage, except in a very few "short supply" classifications. This restriction was lifted during World War II but reinstated after the war. Only since 1955 has marriage been completely removed as a barrier to women's employment in the public service. Thus, from the time of Confederation until now, the status of female public employees has changed from one of mere tolerance to that of full acceptance as co-equals under the law with men.

##### *Women in Canada's Undertakings and Public Service in 1966*

Out of the total federal government employment (including armed forces) of 476,425, 15.7 per cent (or 74,938) were women. Of a total of 145,181 employees under the Civil Service Act in 1966, 27.4 per cent (or 39,828) were women.

##### *Employment by Department or Agency*

A few of the very large departments employ a large proportion of women. Thus, the Department of National Defence employs about 12,000 women. The Department of Veterans Affairs has a special need for female nurses. Some departments, such as National Revenue, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and agencies such as the Unemployment Insurance Commission, require large clerical staffs to take care of an enormous volume of paperwork, and women from large proportions of their personnel.



### *Geographic Location*

The largest number of women employees in the federal service are in Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia, corresponding to the composition of the female labour force as a whole in Canada.

About 40 per cent of female employees under the Civil Service Act in 1966 were located in the Ottawa-Hull area, compared with about 24 per cent of total male employees. This reflects the concentration of office work at headquarters, together with a tendency for jobs outside the capital to be of the "operating" kind usually filled with men.

### *Age Distribution*

The average age of women in the federal service, 39 1/2 years, compares to an average of 43 1/2 years for men. Women's working life, unlike that of men, is in two stages, with peaks of employment between the ages of 20-24 and 45-49.

### *Occupational Composition*

Women account for less than 10 per cent of the Professional group in the federal service. They form a very small proportion of the senior administrative groups, A and B, but comprise almost 20 per cent of the Administrative C group. Four fifths of female employees are in the Office category (typists, stenographers, clerks, office appliance operators, etc.)

Women are found in the traditionally female professional fields such as home economics, library work, social work, nursing, etc., but a significant number are serving as geographers, actuaries, language officers, bacteriologists and chemists. The proportion of women employees is high in the fields of health, welfare, and education.

There are few women working as welfare officers, employment and insurance officers, radio operators, air traffic controllers or excise tax officers, and it is difficult to understand this should be so. There are also few, if any, women employed as patent examiners, dental officers, lecturers and professors, engineers, architects, meteorologists and foreign officers in trade and commerce.

### *Grades and Salaries*

Comparative data for men and women in the federal service as a whole show that women are almost invariably lagging behind men in grade levels, regardless of occupation.

Most women are concentrated in the lower-paid occupations. Thus, as of September, 1966, the median income of women was below \$4,000, compared with \$5,350 for men. Among men 8.2 per cent earned \$10,000 or more in that year, compared with 0.5 per cent of women employees.

## **B. Promotion, Training and Earnings**

### *Recent Promotion*

During the two years previous to the survey, which was taken in the spring of 1967, 43.5 per cent of female public employees had been promoted, compared with 42.7 per cent of males. In monetary terms, this advancement was less rewarding for women, however, because they are mainly in lower-paid positions. In the Professional and Administration A categories, women lagged behind men in terms of promotion.

Approximately one man or woman out of five had remained 2 to 3 years in his or her present grade; one out of eight had remained 4 to 5 years, and one out of four had remained 6 or more years at the same career level.

### *Assessment of Promotion Prospects*

About one third of the men who had not been promoted believed their chances for promotion were excellent or good, compared with one in four of the women. On the other hand, about another third of the men thought their promotion chances were poor or very poor, compared with slightly less than one half of the women.

Of those who felt they had poor or very poor prospects for promotion, about half of both men and women saw no opportunities for advancement from their present grade or position. A small proportion of the women thought discrimination based on sex was the reason.

#### *Career Expectations*

Three quarters of the men and slightly less than that of the women surveyed thought they should be rated at least one grade higher than their present one. Women's career expectations appear somewhat lower than those of men, since four men out of ten expected to be at least three grades higher within ten years, compared to three women out of ten.

#### *Entrance into Different Line of Work*

It is rather surprising to find that almost half the male and one out of three female public employees expressed a desire to enter a different line of work. There is some doubt as to how this question was interpreted by respondents, but it appears to suggest frustration and dissatisfaction with progress or duties on the part of a considerable number of federal employees.

#### *Supervisory Positions*

About four men out of ten held supervisory positions. Fewer than two women out of ten did so. Both men and women, with or without experience of working under a female supervisor, prefer a man in this capacity. However, this view is less strong for those who have had experience working with a woman as supervisor. There is less bias on the part of men when it comes to working with women as assistants or co-workers.

#### *Training by the Civil Service Commission*

During the fiscal years 1960 to 1966, only 16 female employees per year participated in Public Administration courses and Management Improvement training programs. This number constituted less than one per cent of women in the Administration classification. Corresponding figures for men were 296 and two per cent, respectively.

#### *Education Leave*

In 1965, 50 female employees went on educational leave, or one quarter of one per cent of all women employed in the departments reporting that this type of leave was granted. The corresponding figures for men were 170 persons or two fifths of one per cent.

#### *Government-Operated and -Supported Training Programs*

Female public employees have almost invariably had fewer chances than men of participation in government-sponsored training courses, and had less assistance with training courses provided by other educational institutions.

#### *Earnings by Level of Education*

While the principle of equal pay for equal work is fully accepted by the federal government, and pay schedules do not have separate salary rates applicable to men and women, the results of the survey showed that, despite the same level of education and the same range of work experience in and out of the federal service, actual salaries earned by women are less than those of men.

For those women with high school education or less, earnings on average were about 15 per cent less than their male counterparts. At post-secondary school level, the differential was about 35 per cent less for women, and at Bachelor's degree level, about 25 per cent less. The gap was somewhat smaller at the Master's degree or its equivalent level.

In terms of dollars, the differential between median salaries of women and of men ranged from a few hundred dollars to several thousand dollars, depending on occupation, years of work and level of education. This differential appeared to decrease at higher levels of educational achievement.

## C. Regularity of Employment

### *Sick Leave in 1966*

Female public employees show a higher rate of absence than men. About one out of five women was absent 13 or more working days, compared with one out of ten men. And about one third of women were absent 8 or more days during the year, whereas the proportion for men was one fifth.

The proportion of absence varies according to occupation, age and marital status. Thus, it appears that the higher the educational qualifications and the more responsible and better paid the position, the less often a woman employee will be absent.

It appears that among married women two out of four were absent due to casual and/or certified sick leave for 8 or more working days during 1966, compared with one out of four single women, and one out of five single men. About 18 per cent of single men and 14 per cent of single women used no sick leave at all.

About 45 per cent of women aged 25 to 34 averaged more than 8 days of sick leave during 1966. This percentage diminishes as the age of the individual increases — up to 45 years — and then rises again. A similar pattern of absence may be observed for men.

Women also show a higher frequency of absence. About half the women were absent four times or more in 1966, compared to slightly more than one quarter of the men. On the other hand, one woman out of ten did not miss a day during the year, compared with two men out of ten. The frequency of absence was the highest for married and formerly married (widowed, separated or divorced) women between 25 and 34 years of age.

### *Special Leave*

There is little difference between men and women in the use of this type of leave. The percentage of women absent three or more days on special leave was 11.8, compared to 9.3 per cent of men. Approximately, four fifths of men and three quarters of women did not use this type of leave at all during 1966.

Both married men and women used special leave more extensively than their single counterparts. As was to be expected, married women with greater family responsibilities in terms of number of children used special leave more often.

### *Part-time Employment*

A decisive majority of the women now employed (87.1 per cent) prefer to work full time rather than half or three quarters of a day. Opinions might be quite different if a similar inquiry were directed to women outside the labour force.

There appears to be no correlation between salary level and preferences regarding the extend of the working day, although a substantial proportion of professional women would prefer to work on a part-time basis. Among married women one out of five would like to work less than a full day.

### *Mobility of Employees Within the Federal Service*

During the first five years of work the internal mobility of men and women in the federal service appears to be practically the same. Slightly more than one in four have worked for one or more departments other than their present one. Of those who remain longer than five years in the service, women tend to change departments or agencies more often than men.

### *Separations from the Public Service*

The evidence indicates that the turnover rate is almost twice as high (about 15 per cent) among female employees as for men (about 8 per cent), but the rate varies with occupations. Frequency of separation is also higher for women than for men.

### *Reasons for Leaving the Federal Service*

For men under 25, the main reasons given by those who intended to leave the federal service were "to enter a different line of work" and "more pay and better fringe benefits," in that order, whereas for women under 25 the two main reasons cited were "to improve promotion opportunities" and "more pay and better fringe benefits."

Men between 25 and 44 years of age gave reasons for intended separation as "lack of job satisfaction" and dissatisfaction with "agency personnel policies and practices." The same reasons were suggested by women of this age group, but in inverse order of importance. For both sexes, "more pay and better fringe benefits" remained important reasons for leaving.

Married women were primarily dissatisfied with "agency personnel policies and practices."

About three quarters of men, and more than half the women, proposed to enter industry or business as their new field of employment, and about one third of the women, mainly from the Office category, planned to teach.

### *Withdrawal from the Labour Market*

For men who planned to leave the labour market altogether within two months from the time of the survey, continuing education was the reasons for those under 25, and also for one third of those in the 25 to 44 age group. For women of child-bearing age, marriage, pregnancy and family responsibilities were the main reasons for terminating employment.

## **D. Some Characteristics and Problems of Female Public Employees**

### *Marital Status and Family Responsibilities*

Married women accounted for 43.5 per cent of the federal female employees surveyed compared with 52.5 per cent in the Canadian female labour force in 1966. Married women with four or more children comprised a very small proportion of those employed in the 25 to 39 age group, when family responsibilities tend to be heaviest. The younger the children, the smaller the proportion of working mothers.

Approximately one out of five married women with children earned more than \$5,000 annually, compared with one out of four married women with no dependent children in the family.

### *Husband's Income in 1966*

All married women whose earnings were less than \$3,000 indicated that their husbands' income was less than \$7,000. Of those with an income between \$3,000 and \$6,000 about one fifth stated that their husbands earned more than \$7,000, whereas more than one half the women earning above \$6,000 indicated that their husbands' income exceeded \$7,000. More than 90 per cent of married female employees earned less than \$6,000, and fourth fifths of them had husbands with an income below \$7,000.

Married women with five or more children and husbands earning less than \$5,000 accounted for almost 80 per cent of working mothers with that number of children.

### *Comments on Federal Service Employment*

The most pressing need, according to comments from both married and single women, is for expanded community child care facilities and nursery schools in the Ottawa-Hull area. It was suggested that the federal government should take the initiative to see that such facilities are provided in the community, or perhaps establish them adjacent to government buildings where large numbers of working mothers are employed.

A number of commentators proposed that child care and housework expenses should be deductible for income tax purposes.



Some women suggested improvements in on-the-job health facilities and services. About half the comments mentioned lack of adequate restroom facilities, particularly couches, and less than satisfactory standards of cleanliness in restrooms and washrooms, particularly in the provisional wartime buildings which still house some government departments. Suggested improvements ranged from first aid kits to full-scale health units with nurses in attendance.

About one third of the women who commented on the superannuation plan said they would like to be able to designate husbands (in the case of single women, other dependants) for survivor benefits, even if contribution rates had to be increased. The same proportion of commentators favoured earlier retirement, at the age of 55 or after 35 years of service.

As might be expected, the majority of those who proposed changes in maternity leave policies of the government were married and under 44. Suggestions included maintenance of income, in full or in part, during maternity leave, or alternatively, that women should be able to apply all unused sick leave credits toward maternity leave. Some thought that it should be possible to extend the present maximum of six months post-natal leave; others argued against having to pay a double contribution toward the superannuation plan during maternity leave, at a time when they are deprived of their income and face increased family expenses.

#### *Overtime Work*

About two thirds of the female employees had no overtime work during the previous year, while about one quarter were asked to work one to 10 hours, on average, per month, and 8 per cent more than 11 hours per month.

Of those who were not required to work overtime, about three quarters preferred not to have any overtime work. Of those who had worked 1 to 5 hours per month overtime, slightly less than half did not want overtime, and the same proportion applied to those with 6 to 10 hours overtime experience. One third of those who worked 11 hours or more did not wish to work overtime.

Overall 36.7 per cent of female public employees were willing to work some overtime, compared to 31.5 per cent of women actually having worked some overtime. About 10 per cent would like 6 to 10 hours per month of overtime, compared to 4 per cent who had done so in the past. Married women do not wish to have more overtime work than they are actually asked to do now.

#### *Travelling on Official Business*

One out of four single women would decline a position requiring travelling, whereas only one out of eight single men would do so. Among married women, more than half would decline such a position. The proportion increases to two thirds for married women in lower age groups.

### **E. Sources of Recruitment**

#### *Previous Work Experience*

About three quarters of male employees, compared to three fifths of the women, had some previous work experience prior to joining the federal service.

More than half the male employees with previous work experience came from business and industry, one quarter from the armed forces (war veterans enjoyed priority for federal employment), and the remainder from unspecified employers, educational institutions, provincial and local governments, self-employment and international agencies, in that order. Three fifths of female employees came from business and industry, one eighth from unspecified employers, one tenth from educational institutions, and the remainder from provincial and local governments, armed forces, self-employment and international agencies, in that order.



### *Relationship Between Last Occupation and Present Duties*

Of the federal employees surveyed who had work experience prior to entering the federal service, about one third of both men and women stated that their last occupation was related (implying that similar skills or duties were required) to their current job.

### *Immigrant Public Employees*

Between 1946 and 1960 approximately 2 million immigrants came to this country, and 52 per cent of these entered the labour force immediately upon arrival. Of the immigrant public employees included in the survey in the Ottawa-Hull area, two thirds came to Canada after 1946. Despite the five years of residence required to obtain Canadian citizenship, and the preference given to native-born or British subjects in federal civil service appointments, it is interesting to note that the immigrants who arrived between 1946 and 1961 accounted for 53 per cent of the foreign-born federal employees in the capital.

They account for one tenth of the total number of employees included in the survey. Occupationally, foreign-born employees form one quarter of the Professional group and one sixth of both the Administration and the Technical-inspection categories, all of which usually require a university education. This significant contribution has been made primarily by male immigrants, since more than four fifths of female immigrant employees are employed in the Office category.

About half the male immigrant employees surveyed have university education, compared to one fifth of Canadian-born employees. The corresponding proportions for women are 12 and 3 per cent respectively.

### *Recruitment of University Graduates*

The available information is too incomplete to enable one to draw definite conclusions. In some fields, such as engineering, it seems that there are no women applicants. In others, such as the trade and commerce foreign service officers, women graduates have not been appointed, although, by a recent policy change, they are eligible to apply. Recently, more women are being appointed as junior executive officers, although they have not been as successful as men in competing for this class or for that of external affairs foreign service officer. In other occupations, women graduates appear to have the same opportunities for entering the public service as their male counterparts.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, the findings of this study indicate that the federal government has not made full use of the talents and qualifications of women in staffing the Public Service. This under-utilization of women is due to "traditional views on the suitability of women for many types of work and kinds of responsibility, as well as real factors of cost resulting from high absenteeism and turnover."<sup>1</sup> But personnel policies and practices have no doubt been improving in recent years to make more effective use of women's capacities and skills.

In some areas, well-qualified women are not available in sufficient numbers for initial appointment or promotion in, for example, physical and bio-sciences, and as long as this situation continues the government will not be able to recruit women scientists in any significant number. It is possible that there may be differences in the quality of experience between men and women who are otherwise equal in terms of education and years of work. This study did not attempt to analyse the relative efficiency of men and women in comparable positions. However, if such differences really exist, no doubt they reflect in some degree failure in the past to promote women as quickly as men, and they may constitute a barrier to promoting large numbers of women into the upper levels of the Public Service.

There may also be instances in which the employment of women in some positions would decrease the short-term efficiency of the Public Service, although ultimately nothing but negative social attitudes and prejudice limit a woman's full utilization in the areas concerned. For example, the study indicates that both men and women prefer a man as a supervisor. Therefore, those concerned with immediate economies in staffing would be inclined to promote women to supervisory positions only when they have enough superiority over competing male candidates to offset those special problems they may encounter through this preference. The evidence in this study also indicates a smaller proportion of negative attitudes among those who have worked under a woman toward the relative ability of women as a supervisor. This suggests that existing prejudice against women supervisors may gradually disappear. Again, there are types of employment in the federal service, such as the trade and commerce foreign service, or work requiring relations with the public, such as tax investigations, in which women might encounter special problems and difficulties.

These and similar considerations, including some relating to higher rates of absence and turnover among women, as well as questionable practices resulting from prejudice, are the reasons for the disparity between the overall standing of men and women in the Public Service.

The federal government, being a government of all Canadians and in the service of all Canadians, and by virtue of being the largest employer in the country, is politically and morally under obligation to provide leadership in enlightened, progressive and fair employment policies and practices. Moreover, the Public Service of Canada must be a showcase to other governments as well as to private employers in this country. As a strong supporter of the United Nations Organization and of the International Labour Organization, the federal government, by its example, should provide leadership toward the realization of the principle of equality for women, including the important matter of equality in economic opportunities. The government, as an employer, must intensify its efforts to make a maximum use of the abilities and qualifications of women.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Royal Commission on Government Organization, "Management of the Public Service" (Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962), p. 275.

To assist in achieving these obligations and objectives the following recommendations are submitted for consideration:

1. The recent introduction of collective bargaining for federal public servants resulted in the assignment of the Treasury Board as the representative of the federal government in bargaining processes with the public employees' organizations. In order to ensure that women may participate in formulating the government's long-term and non-discriminatory employment and personnel policies and practices, it is recommended that women be appointed to some key positions in the Personnel Policy Branch of the Treasury Board.
2. Canadian institutions of higher learning admit and train steadily increasing numbers of young women. It has been estimated that within the next ten years the number of female university graduates per annum will be four times greater than at present. They will be preparing themselves for a wider range of occupations in response to the gradual disappearance of the demarcation line between traditional male and female occupations, in this country as elsewhere. There have been a few, and rather symbolic, high-level appointments of women to national boards, councils, agencies and diplomatic posts in the public service. In order to utilize efficiently the services of qualified women, more women should be appointed to responsible positions at all levels, provided, of course, that they meet the educational and experience requirements for such positions. This would set an example to private employers in opening the door to women in upper level positions. Furthermore, the appointment of women to a wider variety of occupations would encourage more women to diversify their training.
3. At least one member of the Public Service Commission of Canada should be a woman.
4. Existing public service legislation and regulations prohibit any kind of discrimination against women. But it is obvious that no legislative measures, by themselves, can eradicate effectively the traditional, deep-rooted and negative attitudes toward women in actual employment practices. It is suggested, therefore, that a special and independent commission be appointed periodically, say every five years, to review the effectiveness of implementation of the official government policy of non-discrimination in employment and personnel practices.
5. Because of the large proportion of women in the Canadian labour force, the role and significance of the Women's Bureau of the Canada Department of Labour is of special interest. It is, therefore, recommended that its staff, very inadequate at present, should be increased, its scope of functions and, particularly, its research program be enlarged so that a constructive development of womanpower in this country will be based on scientific research on a national scale. The Women's Bureau should be a focal point for liaison with other government departments that share a concern for the problems of women, such as Manpower and Immigration, and National Health and Welfare.
6. It is recommended that continued efforts be made to improve the status, qualifications and remuneration of personnel officers in all government departments and agencies so that they may assist supervisory staff with employee motivation and encourage active and effective programs of career development for both men and women employees. It should be a matter of serious concern that a high proportion of both male and female employees surveyed (but with varying degrees according to occupation) appear to lack satisfaction in their present duties and would prefer a different line of work.
7. The evidence presented suggests that women participate somewhat less than men in training programs, particularly in higher administration and management courses. This adversely affects their advancement. It is recommended that training officers co-operate closely with

personnel officers in the selection of candidates for training programs. A greater participation of women in training programs and the resulting improvement in their skills would enable them to overcome promotional barriers and undeserved biases. It is also recommended that special training courses be organized within a general skills upgrading program for married women re-entering the public service.

8. In view of the acute shortage of child care services in the Ottawa-Hull area, it is recommended that the federal government consider the possibility of organizing nurseries in, or adjacent to, federal government buildings whenever there is a sufficient number of pre-school-aged children of public employees. These nurseries should be operated on a self-supporting financial basis.
9. Whether a married woman works or not depends to a large extent on her net income. If the wife works, her husband loses any tax deduction allowance for his wife if she earns more than \$250 a year. But apparently our economy needs working married women. It is therefore recommended that child care and housekeeping expenses be deductible from the gross income of working married women. This tax deduction should be progressive, i.e., scaled according to the number of children of pre-school and elementary school age.
10. To attract more married women into the public service, particularly in occupations that are in short supply, it is recommended that the recent offer of part-time employment to professional women (librarians, economists and statisticians) be extended to other occupational groups. Married women should have the option of working a full day, half day or three quarters of a day, and be entitled to all fringe benefits proportionately. The Public Service Commission should maintain contact with married women who have left the service, particularly those who are highly-trained, to keep them informed of available employment opportunities.
11. It is recommended that the formalities necessary to obtain special leave be lessened and that more flexibility be introduced into regulations governing leave without pay (particularly of very short duration) in order that married women employees, and indeed all women who have family responsibilities, may be given time off to cope with problems arising from their dual role as workers and homemakers — problems such as children's dentist appointment, beginning of a school year, shopping. This flexibility would reflect a social adjustment to the specific and real problems facing married women.
12. The present maternity leave provisions in the public service appear to be inadequate. It is recommended that the pre-natal leave of two months (unless deferred by agreement based on a medical certificate) be paid at full salary, or at least at half salary. Alternatively, unused sick and special leave credits should be allowed toward maternity leave at any time during pregnancy, or during the post-natal leave. It is also suggested the post-natal leave, at present a maximum of six months, be extended, upon request, up to a maximum of one year. Further, it is recommended that an employee should not be penalized by having to pay double the amount of premiums toward the superannuation and other fringe benefit plans during maternity leave. Such financial arrangements as recommended should not be permitted to interfere with the employment of married women in the service.
13. Apparently some of the present on-the-job health care facilities and services are not entirely satisfactory. More health units are needed. It is suggested that whenever there are 500 women in a government building a health unit should be established with a full-time nurse. Adequate restrooms should be available with the necessary furniture. This would very likely reduce their higher rate of absence.

14. It is finally proposed that the government agencies (the Public Service Commission, Treasury Board and Dominion Bureau of Statistics) concerned with the collection of statistical data on public employees ensure greater co-ordination and planning in collection of the statistics. They should review the nature of present data to determine their adequacy for meaningful research. For example, at present, there is no central collection of statistical information on training within federal departments. More information is required on the recruitment of male and female university graduates. There is a need for a breakdown by sex of many kinds of statistics, including some of the types derived from the survey conducted for this study.



## APPENDIX A

### STRATIFICATION BY OCCUPATION<sup>1</sup> AND SEX WITH SAMPLING RATIOS<sup>2</sup>

Major Strata <sup>3</sup>	Sampling Ratio	
	Male	Female
<u>PROFESSIONAL</u>		
<u>Physical Sciences:</u> Chemist (1-5, 2A); Chief Chemist, Board of Grain Commissioners; Advisory Chemist (1-3), Customs and Excise; Scientific Officer (1-3, 2A); Senior Scientific Officer (1-3); Patent Examiner (1-7); Meteorological Officer (1-9); Meteorologist (1-9).	1:3	1:1
<u>Bio-Sciences:</u> Research Director (1-6), Research Officer (1-5, 2A) – (Agriculture, Forestry); Bacteriologist (1-6, 2A); Feed Microscopist (1-4); Biologist (1-5, 2A); Food and Drug Officer (1-8); Forestry Officer (1-5, 2A); Chief, Pharmacology and Endocrinology; Pharmacist (1-4).	1:1	1:1
<u>Medicine:</u> Medical Officer (1-6); Medical Specialist (1,2); Physician.	1:1	1:1
<u>Economics, Commerce, Finance:</u> Economist (1-7); Senior Economist (1,2); Chief Statistician (1,2); Senior Research Statistician; Senior Statistician (1,2); Statistician (1-5); Trade and Commerce Officer (1-6); Actuary (1-6); Annuities Actuary; Actuarial Supervisor (1-4).	1:3	1:1
<u>Library:</u> Librarian (1-5); Medical Records Librarian (1-3); Chief Librarian, Agriculture; Librarian and Assistant Librarian, Supreme Court; Senior Librarian, National Library.	1:1	1:1
<u>Social Work:</u> Social Worker (1-6); Welfare Officer (1-5); Welfare Administrator (1-6).	1:1	1:1
<u>Language:</u> Interpreter (1,2); Language Officer (1-5); Translator (1-8, 1A-3A); Translator in training; Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Chief of Development, Chief of Division (1-3), Chief of Production (Translation Bureau).	1:1	1:1
Junior Executive Officer	1:1	1:1
<u>Nursing, Therapy:</u> Nurse (1-6); Nursing Consultant (1,2); Nurse 2, graduate unregistered, Nurse, pending registration; Hospital Nursing Assistant; Physical and Occupational Therapist (1-5).	1:1	1:1
<u>Home Economics:</u> Dietitian (1-5); Home Economist (1-4); Consultant, Dietetic Services, Nutritionist (1-4).	1:1	1:1
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>		
Group A		
Foreign Service Officer (1-10), External Affairs; Foreign Service Officer (1,2), Immigration; Foreign Service Officer (1-8), Trade and Commerce; External Affairs Officer (1-6) <sup>4</sup> .	1:1	1:1
Civil Service Commission Officer (1-7); Personnel Administrator (1-6); Personnel Officer (1-6) <sup>4</sup> .	1:2	1:1
Administrative Officer (1-8); Administrative Assistant; Finance Office (1-6).	1:9	1:1
Defence Production Officer (1-9); Industrial Development and Production Officer (1-5).	1:4	1:1
Group B		
Taxation Director (1-7); Taxation Officer (1-4); Taxation Inspector (1-7); Excise Tax Officer (1-6); Treasury Accountant (1-4, 1A, 2A); Departmental Accountant (1-9); Auditor, Excise Tax (1-7, 1A); Director and Assistant Director, Excise Audit; Senior Treasury Officer; Treasury Auditor (1-8); Treasury Officer; Unemployment Insurance Auditor (1-7); National Defence Auditor; Assistant Chief Auditor, National Defence.	1:2	1:1
Group C		
Employment and Claims Officer (1-6); Employment Officer (1-5); Employment Service Officer (1-8); Employment and Insurance Officer (1-9); Claims Officer (1-7); Insurance Officer (1-4); Manager (1-9, 1A, 3A) and Assistant Manager (6-9), Employment and Claims Office.	1:1	1:1
Editor (1-4); Editor, Law, Supreme Court; Public Information Officer (1-6); Information Officer (1-7); Custodian, National Historic Parks; Superintendent, Historic Sites (1-3); Travel Counsellor (1-4).	1:1	1:1

<sup>1</sup> Occupations as taken from records of Civil Service Commission, and stratified by the author.

<sup>2</sup> Ratios used in selecting sample of employees in the Ottawa-Hull area to be surveyed.

<sup>3</sup> Numbers in brackets refer to occupational grades.

<sup>4</sup> These positions would be more comparable with those in Group C but are placed in Group A because of their relationship to similar but higher-graded occupations.

## APPENDIX A (Concluded)

Major Strata <sup>3</sup>	Sampling Ratio	
	Male	Female
<b>TECHNICAL AND INSPECTION</b>		
Seed Analyst (1,2); Supervising Seed Analyst; Meteorological Technician (1-8); Weather Observer (1, 2); Forest Research Technician (1-5) and Assistant Technician (1-3); Technician (1-4); Hospital Laboratory Technician (1-4, 1A-3A); Dental Technician (1-3); Clinical Technician (1-4); X-Ray Technician (1-4, 1A-3A, 2B).	1:10	1:1
Draftsman; Student Draftsman; Supervising Draftsman (1-3); Chief Draftsman; Map Compiler and Computer (1-4); Map Compiler and Computer Supervisor (1,2)	1:5	1:1
Computer Systems Programmer (1-7)	1:1	1:1
<b>POSTAL, CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION</b>		
Postal Officer (1-9); Postal Superintendent; Area Superintendent; Assistant Director, Postal Service; Postal Clerk (1,2).	1:4	1:1
Letter Carrier; Mail Dispatcher; Mail Handler; Postmaster (9-19).	1:4	1:1
Customs Excise Officer (1-3); Assistant Chief Dominion Customs Appraiser; Customs Excise Superintendent (1-6); Customs Excise Supervisor (1-4); Customs and Excise Inspector (1-3); Immigration Officer (1-10); Canadian Immigration Affairs Officers (1-6).	1:1	1:1
<b>CLERICAL AND RELATED</b>		
Clerical and Regulatory (1-7), (Special A); Clerk (1-4); Clerical Assistant.	1:36	1:25
Supervisor, Office Services (1-5); Chief Clerk; Head Clerk; Principal Clerk; Supervising Clerk.	1:1	1:1
Typist (1-3).	1:1	1:1
Stenographer (1-3); Secretarial (1-9, A,B,C.); Stenographer-Secretary; Secretary to Executive	1:2	1:30
Electronic Data Processor (1-8); Senior Electronic Data Processor (1-8); Calculating Equipment Operator (1-4); Calculating Equipment Supervisor (1-3); Data Processing (1-8, A,B,C); Bookkeeping Equipment Operator (1-4); Bookkeeping Equipment Supervisor (1-3); Communicator (1-5).	1:3	1:5
Duplicating Equipment Operator (1-4); Duplicating Equipment Supervisor (1-3).	1:1	1:1

Note: The occupational titles above were in use in 1965 and 1966, but some have since been revised. The grading system of some occupations was changed in the reclassification system, and in some cases, such as Treasury Officer and National Defence Auditor and Draftsman, the sample was drawn from incumbents by either the former or new grading system.

## APPENDIX B

CANADA DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

DIRECTOR-GENERAL  
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT



MINISTÈRE DU TRAVAIL DU CANADA

OTTAWA 4, Ontario,  
March 27, 1967.

Dear Sir or Madam:

In co-operation with the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Labour has arranged for a study of certain aspects of the utilization of employees in the Federal Civil Service to be undertaken by Professor S. Judek of the University of Ottawa.

Many factors affect the performance of employees in their jobs. We need to know more about those which contribute to or inhibit the best use of the abilities of men and women in the Civil Service. It is the aim of this study to learn more about how certain employment policies and practices, employee attitudes, and human relations in general influence job performance and satisfaction. To this end we ask for your views by means of the enclosed questionnaire. Women employees are invited to comment also (Part B) on matters of particular concern to them, so that subjects requiring further study may be noted.

You happen to be among the thirty per cent of federal civil servants in the Ottawa-Hull area selected to participate in this survey. Most occupations in which both men and women are employed are represented. In this type of "sample" survey, it is of utmost importance that all who receive a questionnaire should reply.

We assure you that every step has been taken to ensure the anonymity of the questionnaire. The number stamped on the questionnaire refers to a broad occupational grouping, and not to any individual. While distribution of survey material is being handled through your department, your questionnaire return will not be available to anyone in your department or agency. Please do not sign your return.

Will you kindly assist in this important study by completing and returning the questionnaire in the franked envelope provided? Now is always the best time - in any case, may we receive it within the next week?

Thank you in advance for your co-operation. The results should prove of value to you and your colleagues, and of assistance to the government in developing future personnel policies and practices.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gil Schonning".

Gil Schonning

# APPENDIX C

CANADA DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

## SURVEY OF UTILIZATION OF EMPLOYEES IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA



### PART A

COMPLETE THE QUESTIONS BY FILLING IN THE BLANKS  
OR CHECKING (✓) THE APPROPRIATE BLANKS

1. Department or Agency		FOR OFFICE USE	
2. Age Group			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> under 20	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 20-24 years	3 <input type="checkbox"/> 25-29 years	4 <input type="checkbox"/> 30-34 years
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 35-39 years	6 <input type="checkbox"/> 40-44 years	7 <input type="checkbox"/> 45-54 years	8 <input type="checkbox"/> 55-64 years
9 <input type="checkbox"/> 65 years and over			
3. Country of Birth		4. If an immigrant, indicate time of your arrival in Canada.	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Canada	2 <input type="checkbox"/> elsewhere	1 <input type="checkbox"/> before 1946	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1946- 1960
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> 1961 and after	
5. Sex		6. Marital Status	
1 <input type="checkbox"/> male	2 <input type="checkbox"/> female	1 <input type="checkbox"/> single	2 <input type="checkbox"/> married
		3 <input type="checkbox"/> widowed, separated or divorced	
7. Education (Check <b>HIGHEST</b> level reached)			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> elementary and some high school		2 <input type="checkbox"/> some high school and specialized training (e.g., business, technological, etc.)	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> high school graduate		4 <input type="checkbox"/> post-secondary school (e.g., nursing, technological institutes, teachers' training, etc.)	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> bachelor's degree or its equivalent		6 <input type="checkbox"/> master's degree or its equivalent	
		7 <input type="checkbox"/> doctor's degree (M.D., Ph.D., etc.)	
8. For highest level checked give country where education obtained.			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Canada	2 <input type="checkbox"/> France	3 <input type="checkbox"/> U.K.	4 <input type="checkbox"/> U.S.A.
5 <input type="checkbox"/> Elsewhere			
9. Give your present class and grade, without abbreviating. (If your position has been converted under the new classification revision programme, give class and grade immediately before conversion).			
Class	Grade	Job Title (if any)	
10. Circle <b>TWO BOXES</b> , one to indicate your <b>STARTING</b> salary in the federal service, and one to indicate your <b>CURRENT</b> salary.			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> under \$2,000	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2,000- 2,499	3 <input type="checkbox"/> 2,500- 2,999	4 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,000- 3,499
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3,500- 3,999	6 <input type="checkbox"/> 4,000- 4,499	7 <input type="checkbox"/> 4,500- 4,999	8 <input type="checkbox"/> 5,000- 5,499
9 <input type="checkbox"/> 5,500- 5,999	10 <input type="checkbox"/> 6,000- 6,499	11 <input type="checkbox"/> 6,500- 6,999	12 <input type="checkbox"/> 7,000- 7,499
13 <input type="checkbox"/> 7,500- 7,999	14 <input type="checkbox"/> 8,000- 8,499	15 <input type="checkbox"/> 8,500- 8,999	16 <input type="checkbox"/> 9,000- 9,499
17 <input type="checkbox"/> 9,500- 9,999	18 <input type="checkbox"/> 10,000- 10,999	19 <input type="checkbox"/> 11,000- 11,999	20 <input type="checkbox"/> 12,000- 12,999
21 <input type="checkbox"/> 13,000- 13,999	22 <input type="checkbox"/> 14,000- 14,999	23 <input type="checkbox"/> 15,000- 15,999	24 <input type="checkbox"/> 16,000- and over
11. Do you supervise others? That is, do you make recommendations regarding promotion and leave, are you responsible for discipline, as well as allocating work?			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes		2 <input type="checkbox"/> no	
12. How many years have you worked in the federal service?			
1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 years or less	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5	3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10	4 <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20	6 <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25	7 <input type="checkbox"/> 26 and over	

13. How many years have you worked **OUTSIDE THE FEDERAL SERVICE?** (Include self-employment, military service, but do not include summer jobs, casual employment, jobs after school, etc.)

FOR OFFICE USE

1 ☐ None      2 ☐ 2 years or less      3 ☐ 3-5      4 ☐ 6-10      5 ☐ 11-15      6 ☐ 16-20      7 ☐ 21-25      8 ☐ 26 and over

14. a) Was your last occupation, if any, just before your present position in the federal service, related to the work you are now doing?

1 ☐ Yes      2 ☐ No

- b) How long did you work with the last employer prior to your present position in the federal service?

1 ☐ 2 years or less      2 ☐ 3-5      3 ☐ 6-10      4 ☐ 11-15      5 ☐ 16 and over

- c) What was the activity of this last employer prior to your present position?

1 ☐ international agency      2 ☐ provincial or local government      3 ☐ business or industry      4 ☐ educational institution  
5 ☐ armed forces      6 ☐ self-employed      7 ☐ other

15. Since you started to work in the federal service, how many times have you left the federal service for any reason for a period of 6 months or more? (Do not consider leave without pay as having left work).

1 ☐ none      2 ☐ once      3 ☐ twice      4 ☐ three times or more

16. For how many other federal departments or agencies have you worked?

1 ☐ no other      2 ☐ one      3 ☐ 2-3      4 ☐ 4 or more

17. Within the past five years, or since you started to work in the federal service, have you taken any training programmes, of at least two weeks' duration (excluding language courses), as follows:

- a) Courses operated by the Government

Duration	Full-time			Part-time		
2 weeks up to one month	1 <input type="checkbox"/> none	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	3 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses	4 <input type="checkbox"/> none	5 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	6 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses
1 month up to three months	7 <input type="checkbox"/> none	8 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	9 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses	10 <input type="checkbox"/> none	11 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	12 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses
3 months up to one year or more	13 <input type="checkbox"/> none	14 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	15 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses	16 <input type="checkbox"/> none	17 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	18 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses

- b) Courses not operated by the Government for which you were given time off with pay or for which you received governmental financial assistance.

Duration	Full-time			Part-time		
2 weeks up to one month	1 <input type="checkbox"/> none	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	3 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses	4 <input type="checkbox"/> none	5 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	6 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses
1 month up to three months	7 <input type="checkbox"/> none	8 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	9 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses	10 <input type="checkbox"/> none	11 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	12 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses
3 months up to one year or more	13 <input type="checkbox"/> none	14 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	15 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses	16 <input type="checkbox"/> none	17 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 courses	18 <input type="checkbox"/> more than 2 courses

18. Are you leaving the federal service within the next two months to take another job?

1 ☐ Yes - Complete Question 19.      2 ☐ No - Skip to Question 20.



19. a) Reasons for leaving the federal service.

Check the **MOST IMPORTANT** reason **TWICE**. Check any other reasons, up to two more, once.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> more pay                                | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> better fringe benefits                | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> to improve promotion opportunities                       |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> to get into different line of work      | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> lack of job satisfaction              | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> dissatisfied with agency personnel policies or practices |
| 7 <input type="checkbox"/> prefers different geographical location | 8 <input type="checkbox"/> time required to get to and from work | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> transportation difficulties                              |

b) Will this new job give you higher, same or lower pay than the one you are leaving?

- |                                       |                                     |                                      |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> higher pay | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> same pay | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> lower pay | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

c) Are fringe benefits (such as retirement, health insurance, leave, etc.) better on the new job, the same or poorer?

- |                                   |                                 |                                   |                                       |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> better | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> same | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> poorer | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

d) Who will be your new employer?

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> business or industry    | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> provincial or local government | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> international agency |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> educational institution | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> self-employed                  | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> other                |

e) Will your new employer be outside Canada?

- |                                |                               |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|

20. a) Are you leaving the labour market altogether within the next two months?

- |                                |                               |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|

b) If yes, please check the reason from one of the following:

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> poor health                    | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> marriage                      | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> pregnancy  |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> to stay home with the children | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> to care for parents or spouse | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> spouse's employment moved to different geographical location |
| 7 <input type="checkbox"/> retirement on pension          | 8 <input type="checkbox"/> to attend school              | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> other  |

21. Is there a different line of work in the federal service, involving greater responsibility and/or reward, for which you are qualified and which you would like to enter?

- |                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> no - skip to 24 |
|--------------------------------|--|

22. If yes, what do you think your chances are of entering this line of work?

- |                                      |                                 |  |                                 |                                      |                                       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> very good | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> good | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> about 50-50 | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> poor | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> very poor | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

23. If you think your chances are **POOR** or **VERY POOR**, what do you think is the most important reason? (Check one)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> no suitable openings in other line of work         | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> my seniors are not interested in the development of my career |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> women not usually considered for this line of work | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> men not usually considered for this line of work              |
|   | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> other   |

FOR OFFICE USE

	FOR OFFICE USE
<p>24. In terms of your abilities and qualifications,</p> <p>a) What is the grade you think you should have achieved?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> present grade</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> one grade higher</div> <div>3 <input type="checkbox"/> two grades higher</div> <div>4 <input type="checkbox"/> three or more grades higher</div> </div> <p>b) What is the highest grade you hope to achieve <b>IN THE NEXT TEN YEARS</b> if you remain in the federal service?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> present grade</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 grades higher</div> <div>3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 grades higher</div> <div>4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 grades or more higher</div> </div>	
<p>25. Give the total time you have been in your present grade or level. (If your position has been converted, add the total time in the class and grade you held immediately prior to conversion up until now.)</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> less than 2 years</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 - 3 years</div> <div>3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4-5 years</div> <div>4 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 years or more</div> </div>	
<p>26. Have you received a promotion or upward reclassification within the past 2 years?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes - skip to question 29</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> no - complete questions 27 and 28</div> </div>	
<p>27. If no, what do you think your chances are for promotion in your department or agency in the next two years?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> very good</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> good</div> <div>3 <input type="checkbox"/> about 50-50</div> <div>4 <input type="checkbox"/> poor</div> <div>5 <input type="checkbox"/> very poor</div> <div>6 <input type="checkbox"/> don't know</div> </div>	
<p>28. If you think your chances for promotion or upward reclassification in the near future are <b>POOR</b> or <b>VERY POOR</b> what do you think is the <b>MOST IMPORTANT</b> reason? (Check one)</p> <div style="display: flex; flex-wrap: wrap;"> <div style="width: 50%;"> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> inadequate education and experience</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> poor communication with my supervisor</p> <p>5 <input type="checkbox"/> very few opportunities exist for promotion from my grade and/or position</p> <p>7 <input type="checkbox"/> requirements at the higher grades make it difficult or awkward to fill the position with a men</p> <p>9 <input type="checkbox"/> regardless of requirements, women are preferred to men of equal training and ability</p> <p>11 <input type="checkbox"/> regardless of requirements, a man must be clearly superior to a woman before being selected for promotion</p> <p>13 <input type="checkbox"/> too near retirement age</p> </div> <div style="width: 50%;"> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> inability and unwillingness to move to another locality</p> <p>4 <input type="checkbox"/> my supervisor underestimates the importance of my job</p> <p>6 <input type="checkbox"/> requirements at the higher grades make it difficult or awkward to fill the position with a woman</p> <p>8 <input type="checkbox"/> regardless of requirements, men are preferred to women of equal training and ability</p> <p>10 <input type="checkbox"/> regardless of requirements, a woman must be clearly superior to a man before being selected for promotion</p> <p>12 <input type="checkbox"/> authority for promotion too far removed</p> <p>14 <input type="checkbox"/> other</p> </div> </div>	
<p>29. In the upper grades of your occupational field at present, how would you compare the performance of men and women?</p> <p>a) Non-supervisory</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> men better</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> women better</div> <div>3 <input type="checkbox"/> no difference</div> <div>4 <input type="checkbox"/> no opinion</div> </div> <p>b) Supervisory</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div>1 <input type="checkbox"/> men better</div> <div>2 <input type="checkbox"/> women better</div> <div>3 <input type="checkbox"/> no difference</div> <div>5 <input type="checkbox"/> no opinion</div> </div>	

	FOR OFFICE USE
<p>30. Have you ever worked under the direct supervision of a woman?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> no</span> </div>	
<p>31. Have you ever worked closely with one or more women at levels comparable to your own?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> no</span> </div>	
<p>32. Have you ever had a woman as an immediate assistant (other than secretary)?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> no</span> </div>	
<p>33. If you were free to select your assistant, your immediate supervisor, or a colleague with whom you whom you would be working very closely, would you prefer a man, a woman, or does it make any difference?</p> <p>a) For my assistant, I would prefer:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> man</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> woman</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> no difference</span> </div> <p>b) For my immediate supervisor, I would prefer:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> man</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> woman</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> no difference</span> </div> <p>c) For a close working colleague, I would prefer:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> man</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> woman</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> no difference</span> </div>	
<p>34. Would you decline a position that would necessitate travelling on official business?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> yes</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> no</span> </div>	
<p>35. If no, how much travelling would you be prepared to undertake in the course of your work?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div> <p>1 <input type="checkbox"/> occasional day outside city</p> <p>3 <input type="checkbox"/> occasional trips of more than a week's duration</p> <p>5 <input type="checkbox"/> frequent trips of more than a week's duration</p> <p>7 <input type="checkbox"/> other</p> </div> <div> <p>2 <input type="checkbox"/> occasional trips of less than a week's duration</p> <p>4 <input type="checkbox"/> frequent trips of less than a week's duration</p> <p>6 <input type="checkbox"/> unlimited travel</p> </div> </div>	
<p>36. a) How many times were you away from work in 1966 due to casual and/or certified sick leave?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> Once</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> Twice</span> <span>4 <input type="checkbox"/> Three times</span> <span>5 <input type="checkbox"/> Four times or more</span> </div> <p>b) How many working days did you miss altogether in 1966 due to casual and/or certified sick leave?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 days</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4-7 days</span> <span>4 <input type="checkbox"/> 8-12 days</span> <span>5 <input type="checkbox"/> 13 or more days</span> </div>	
<p>37. Of the total days you were absent in 1966, indicate separately the number of days lost for</p> <p>a) Casual sick leave</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 days</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 days</span> <span>4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5-7 days</span> </div> <p>b) Certified sick leave (requiring doctor's certificate)</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 days</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 days</span> <span>4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5-7 days</span> <span>5 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 or more days</span> </div>	
<p>38. How many working days did you miss in 1966 under the special leave provisions?</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <span>1 <input type="checkbox"/> None</span> <span>2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 days</span> <span>3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 days</span> <span>4 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 or more days</span> </div>	

(Female employees please complete Part B)

# PART B

## To Be Completed By Female Employees Only

39. a) Number of children, if any, partly or wholly supported by you and/or your husband:

FOR OFFICE USE

1 ☐ None      2 ☐ One      3 ☐ Two      4 ☐ Three      5 ☐ Four      6 ☐ Five or more

b) Number of children by age group:

Under 6 years      1 ☐ none      2 ☐ 1-2      3 ☐ 3 or more  
 6 to 18 years      1 ☐ none      2 ☐ 1-2      3 ☐ 3 or more  
 19 years and over      1 ☐ None      2 ☐ 1-2      3 ☐ 3 or more

40. Does your employment in the federal service sometimes require overtime work for which you receive leave or pay? (And if yes, indicate the average number of hours of overtime work **PER MONTH** during the last twelve months)

1 ☐ no overtime      2 ☐ 1-5 hours      3 ☐ 6-10 hours      4 ☐ 11 hours or more

41. Each month, on the average, I would like to work

1 ☐ no overtime      2 ☐ 1-5 hours of overtime      3 ☐ 6-10 hours of overtime      4 ☐ 11 hours or more of overtime

42. If you were free to determine your working day would you prefer to work a full-day, a half-day or three-quarters of a day and be paid and granted employee benefits proportionately?

1 ☐ full-day      2 ☐ half-day      3 ☐ three-quarters of a day

43. Husband's annual earnings in 1966:

1 ☐ under \$3,000      2 ☐ 3,000-3,999      3 ☐ 4,000-4,999      4 ☐ 5,000-5,999      5 ☐ 6,000-6,999  
 6 ☐ 7,000-7,999      7 ☐ 8,000-8,999      8 ☐ 9,000-9,999      9 ☐ 10,000-11,999      10 ☐ 12,000-13,999  
 11 ☐ 14,000-15,999      12 ☐ 16,000-17,999      13 ☐ 18,000-19,999      14 ☐ 20,000 and over

44. Are there any things which you feel should be changed in order to enable women in the federal service to make a better contribution, or to improve their position, or to obtain more satisfaction from their work? (For example, on-the-job health care provisions, maternity leave practices, community child care facilities, promotional opportunities, superannuation provisions, etc. etc.) Give your comments below.

Thank you for your co-operation

**APPENDIX 2-1**  
**EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE, BY TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT, PROVINCE AND SEX, SEPTEMBER 1966**

Province	Under the Civil Service Act				Excluded from the Civil Service Act												Total							
	Full-time		Part-time <sup>1</sup>		Salaried Departmental Employees		Employees in Crown Corporations						Prevailing Rate		Ships' Officers and Crews		Casuals and Others		Number		Per Cent			
							Agency Corporations		Proprietary Corporations		Other Crown Corporations		Departmental Corporations and Statutory Boards											
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female		
Newfoundland	2,138	335	9	2	529	38	6	2	6,678	412	6	5	73	15	384	63	340	—	836	28	10,999	900	3.7	1.2
Prince Edward Island	590	131	2	1	97	9	7	1	970	51	—	—	—	—	151	20	163	—	207	5	2,188	218	0.7	0.3
Nova Scotia	5,474	1,738	23	5	900	110	284	19	4,885	381	36	14	285	72	2,117	271	2,275	—	1,978	177	17,257	2,787	5.7	3.8
New Brunswick	3,759	1,150	14	3	728	34	115	6	6,832	416	30	12	101	20	805	173	218	—	740	247	13,340	2,061	4.5	2.8
Quebec	18,659	5,597	124	26	3,726	116	196	10	23,532	1,424	142	59	368	38	2,036	216	2,111	—	2,036	187	62,422	10,611	11.1	6.1
Ontario	49,130	12,547	245	50	5,238	2,416	1,036	196	33,195	4,331	1,427	652	3,096	798	4,265	2,040	215	2	4,557	2,898	124,113	36,470	35.0	49.5
Manitoba	5,311	1,786	22	5	1,191	420	239	10	13,263	1,266	197	383	62	12	1,017	383	41	1	817	487	22,160	4,733	7.4	6.4
Saskatchewan	2,773	856	9	2	2,436	455	1	—	4,076	263	43	18	96	13	432	108	—	—	533	56	10,399	1,771	3.5	2.4
Alberta	6,154	2,045	24	6	1,657	661	44	8	7,122	597	61	42	325	42	1,480	286	21	—	984	389	17,872	4,076	6.0	5.5
British Columbia	9,438	3,607	45	10	2,589	570	209	16	6,079	665	78	51	270	54	1,866	529	954	—	1,780	500	23,308	6,002	7.8	8.1
Yukon and Northwest Territories	805	210	3	1	353	273	236	8	303	8	—	—	—	—	1,079	67	50	—	407	65	3,236	632	1.1	0.8
Abroad	1,130	389	4	1	799	1,061	2	2	8,343	610	6	3	57	46	—	—	—	—	136	122	10,477	2,254	3.5	3.1
Total	105,353	39,828	487	117	19,703	7,093	8,439	1,280	120,285	12,157	2,146	1,777	5,356	1,367	16,681	4,666	4,013	3	15,708	5,527	298,171	73,805	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Estimated distribution

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division, Government Employment and Payrolls Section.



## APPENDIX 2-2

### SELECTED OCCUPATIONS OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, BY SEX AND GRADE, SEPTEMBER 1966

Class Group and Title	Grade														Total	% of Total
	Sex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Other			
Professional																
Chemist	M	16	43	37	14	7									117	74.5
	F	18	19	3	—	—									40	25.5
Bacteriologist	M	5	15	12	6	1									39	72.2
	F	4	10	1	—	—									15	27.8
Pharmacist	M		24	12	6										42	79.2
	F		8	3	—										11	20.8
Medical Officer	M	13	56	151	51	33	16								320	93.3
	F	7	6	6	3	1	—								23	6.7
Economist	M	15	33	36	63	44	21	12						12	236	94.8
	F	2	3	2	4	2	—	—							13	5.2
Statistician	M	26	48	69	50	29								40	262	83.4
	F	8	11	16	10	4								3	52	16.6
Archivist	M	9	9	7	5	2									32	80.0
	F	5	2	1	—	—									8	20.0
Librarian	M	10	9	14	12	3									48	33.1
	F	18	23	24	19	11								2	97	66.9
Social Worker	M	2	8	7	2	1									20	29.0
	F	17	20	8	4	—									49	71.0
Language Officer	M	13	24	1	5	2									45	58.4
	F	22	7	2	—	1									32	41.6
Junior Executive Officer	M														88	62.4
	F														53	37.6
Research Scientist	M	322	556	43	18										939	97.0
	F	7	19	2	1										29	3.0
Administration																
Administration A	M														1,198	90.3
	F														129	99.7
Foreign Service Officer, E.A.	M	58	56	53	58	56	42	27	30	9	6				405	94.4
	F	6	5	2	4	4	1	1	1	—	—				24	5.6
Civil Service Commission Officer	M	4	26	69	53	22	26	17							222	86.7
	F	2	4	14	8	3	2	1							34	13.3
Personnel Administrator	M	14	71	77	54	41	13								270	90.0
	F	1	15	8	5	1	—								30	10.0
Defence Production Officer	M	2	79	13	29	46	55	22	19	36					301	88.0
	F	1	29	1	5	2	3	—	—	—					41	12.0
Administration B	M														2,009	90.1
	F														220	9.9
Taxation Officer	M	782	447	326	166										1,721	90.7
	F	149	22	4	4										176	9.3
Treasury Accountant	M	142	100	43	3										288	86.7
	F	27	10	7	—										44	13.3
Administration C	M														5,714	79.3
	F														1,491	20.7

# APPENDIX 2-2 (Continued)

Class Group and Title	Grade														Total	% of Total
	Sex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Other			
Employment Officer	M	237	101	47	7	5								397	71.8	
	F	122	24	10	—	—								156	28.2	
Employment Service Officer	M	297	845	211	96	63	18	13	3					1,546	73.9	
	F	133	349	47	11	6	1	—	—					547	26.1	
Claims Officer	M	15	97	165	20	74	34	10						415	59.5	
	F	15	106	132	9	14	5	1						282	40.5	
Insurance Officer	M	12	72	32	8									124	64.2	
	F	10	45	14	—									69	35.8	
External Affairs Officer	M	4	32	19	11	6	1							73	66.4	
	F	4	22	10	1	—	—							37	33.6	
Editor	M	7	12	15	1									35	54.7	
	F	10	14	2	3									29	45.3	
Public Information Officer	M	6	27	47	35	19	6							140	80.5	
	F	4	14	10	5	1	—							34	19.5	
Personnel Officer	M	9	76	43	12	7	4							151	80.7	
	F	7	15	11	3	—	—							36	19.3	
Administrative Officer	M	333	399	446	353	266	223	200	190					2,410	93.0	
	F	78	41	30	14	8	4	5	2					182	7.0	
Translator	M	27	24	53	24	10	5							143	62.4	
	F	15	25	29	12	4	—							86	37.6	
Departmental Accountant	M	65	71	53	45	28	12	4	2					280	89.5	
	F	9	66	4	3	—	1	—	—					33	10.5	
Technical and Inspection																
Computer Systems Programmer	M	23	43	71	70	47	17	6						277	87.4	
	F	10	6	16	6	2	—	—						40	12.6	
Technical Officer	M	60	342	809	869	613	573	358	152	160	63	73		4,072	94.8	
	F	15	80	52	28	19	10	10	5	2	2	2		225	5.2	
Draftsman	M	158	170	475	63	10	4							880	93.1	
	F	21	13	30	1	—	—							65	6.9	
Technician, Meteorological	M	141	151	181	218	77	134	20	10					932	97.2	
	F	4	2	9	3	5	4	—	—					27	2.8	
Technician, Forest Research	M	17	136	123	68	11								355	89.4	
	F	7	21	13	1	—								42	10.6	
Assistant Technician	M	32	235	567										834	72.0	
	F	55	128	142										325	28.0	
Technician	M	1,053	1,068	754	350									3,205	94.3	
	F	113	50	21	8									192	5.7	
Postal, Customs and Immigration																
Postal	M													11,197	93.9	
	F													724	6.1	
Postal Officer	M	1,067	488	235	147	51	442	67	20	9				2,126	98.2	
	F	30	9	1	—	—	—	—	—	—				40	1.8	
Postal Clerk	M	452	8,615											9,071	93.0	
	F	239	445											684	7.0	
Customs	M													3,103	95.6	
	F													142	4.4	
Customs Excise Officer	M	32	1,350	1,265									456	3,103	95.6	
	F	6	87	46									3	142	4.4	

# APPENDIX 2-2 (Concluded)

Class Group and Title	Grade														Total	% of Total
	Sex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Other			
Office																
Clerical	M														11,443	40.3
	F														16,942	59.7
Clerical and Regulatory Level	M	973	1,011	1,469	1,492	1,214	253	48						120	6,581	40.5
	F	2,084	2,288	2,764	1,710	560	66	16						162	9,650	59.5
Clerk	M	683	787	1,234	1,042										3,746	35.9
	F	1,521	2,059	1,792	1,316										6,688	64.1
Principal, Supervising, Head, Chief Clerk	M	561	214	109	2										886	66.1
	F	340	73	41	1										455	33.9
Supervisor, Office Services	M	15	5	4	6	4									34	65.4
	F	15	1	2	—	—									18	34.6
Clerical Assistant	M														181	84.2
	F														34	15.8
Other	M														5	4.9
	F														97	95.1
Typing and Related																
Duplicating Equipment Operator	M	45	79	47	9									42	222	54.5
	F	40	110	18	2									15	185	45.5
Communicator	M	43	98	92	22	9									264	52.5
	F	109	64	47	16	3									239	47.5
Electronic Data Processor	M	19	28	37	30	14	18	7	6						159	30.8
	F	52	147	90	50	8	5	5	1						358	69.2
Communication Level	M	29	55	121	25	5									235	67.1
	F	37	31	33	12	2									145	32.9
Data Processing Level	M	42	10	39	17	19	15	17	—						159	28.0
	F	284	20	61	13	19	7	3	2						409	72.0
Hospital																
Technician, Hospital Laboratory	M	1	11	17	17										66	27.8
	F	19	77	62	13										171	72.2
Technician, X-Ray	M	1	17	9	7										34	43.6
	F	8	33	3	—										44	56.4
Hospital Laboratory Helper	M	11	20												17	40.5
	F	6	5												25	59.5
Clinical Technician	M	—	18	10	3										31	55.4
	F	5	13	7	—										25	44.6
Hospital Cook	M	7	147	60	20	6									240	85.1
	F	15	22	5	—	—									42	14.9

Source: D.B.S., Public Finance and Transportation Division,  
Government Employment and Payrolls Section.

**APPENDIX 3-1**  
**PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES PROMOTED WITHIN PAST TWO YEARS,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, SEX, AND CURRENT SALARY LEVEL**

Occupational Group and Sex		Current Salary Level																Not Stated			
		Under \$3,000		\$3,000- 3,999		\$4,000- 4,999		\$5,000- 5,999		\$6,000- 6,999		\$7,000- 8,999		\$9,000- 10,999		\$11,000- 12,999				\$13,000- and over	
		%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.			%	No.
Professional	Males	—	—	—	—	50.0	2	23.9	39	26.8	96	51.7	319	47.0	391	60.7	296	43.3	410	4	
	Females	—	—	40.0	5	7.7	13	29.0	62	26.2	61	56.2	105	50.8	63	34.6	26	45.5	22	11	
Administration A, B and C	Males	—	—	—	—	—	—	74.4	16	45.6	152	69.3	1,097	59.2	639	57.2	483	52.0	793	7	
	Females	—	—	—	—	—	—	60.0	5	60.6	33	58.9	151	52.6	38	41.7	12	40.0	10	3	
Technical and Inspection	Males	—	—	11.8	90	43.2	175	32.0	667	31.7	896	43.6	409	45.4	53	45.2	37	50.0	38	11	
	Females	33.3	3	38.0	50	38.7	75	21.6	102	44.1	59	61.1	18	66.6	3	—	—	—	—	13	
Postal, Customs and Immigration	Males	—	—	—	—	25.3	164	8.9	579	27.1	83	56.0	35	75.0	4	—	1	30.0	8	25	
	Females	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	3	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Office	Males	1.3	508	45.5	1,095	34.6	1,319	30.9	1,328	67.7	878	75.0	70	16.1	48	50.0	6	66.7	10	83	
	Females	24.9	866	44.8	3,159	47.0	4,679	35.6	1,927	48.8	605	96.4	139	—	—	—	—	—	—	122	
Percentage Promoted of Total		1.3	508	42.8	1,189	34.6	1,660	26.5	2,629	47.3	2,105	60.9	1,930	52.5	1,135	57.9	823	49.0	1,259	130	
in Salary Level		24.9	869	44.9	3,215	46.8	4,769	34.8	2,099	47.1	758	71.1	415	51.9	104	36.8	38	43.8	32	149	

# APPENDIX 3-2 LENGTH OF TIME IN PRESENT GRADE, BY OCCUPATION AND SEX

Selected Occupations	Less Than 2 Years		2-3		4-5		6 Years or More		Total Responding		Time Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total Responding											
Professional												
Physical and Bio-Science, Medical Officer and Specialist Medical Officer	44.8	56.4	24.0	21.8	18.6	10.9	12.6	10.9	692	55	4	—
Economics, Commerce, Finance, Social Worker and Junior Executive Officer	71.4	70.8	18.7	21.3	7.6	4.5	2.3	3.4	647	89	—	3
Librarian, Language Officer, Nurse and Dietitian Administration A	53.6	49.5	21.3	20.6	7.1	11.2	18.0	18.7	211	214	2	7
Foreign Service Officer, Civil Service Commission Officer, Administrative Officer and Defence Production Officer	43.8	42.0	26.3	23.9	15.1	21.0	14.8	13.1	2,578	176	18	1
Administration B and C	41.8	44.0	23.0	12.0	19.1	14.7	16.1	29.3	586	75	5	—
Taxation Officer, Employment Officer and Editor Technical and Inspection	35.4	45.3	19.4	21.4	18.2	16.3	27.0	17.0	2,130	289	11	6
Seed Analyst and Draftsman	77.4	82.1	15.4	17.9	5.5	—	1.7	—	234	28	1	—
Computer Systems Programmer												
Postal, Customs and Immigration												
Postal Officer, Letter Carrier, Postmaster, Customs Excise Officer and Immigration Officer	23.0	75.0	14.8	25.0	11.4	—	50.8	—	888	8	14	—
Office												
Clerical and Typing —												
Clerical Assistant, Supervising Head, Chief Clerk, Typist and Stenographer	43.0	42.6	21.4	21.0	11.0	11.7	24.6	24.7	4,917	10,528	4	153
Processor and Operators —												
Electronic Data Processor and Duplicating Equipment Operator	37.9	37.9	20.7	26.3	13.4	15.3	28.0	20.5	425	802	1	14
Total Number	5,672	5,253	2,866	2,612	1,792	1,489	2,978	2,910	13,308	12,264	60	184
Per Cent Distribution	42.6	42.8	21.6	21.3	13.5	12.1	22.4	23.8	100.0	100.0		



**APPENDIX 3-3**  
**SELF-ASSESSED PROMOTION PROSPECTS, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

	Excellent		Good		50-50		Poor		Very Poor		Don't Know		Total Responding		Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Per Cent of Total Responding																
Professional Administration A Administration B and C Technical and Inspection Postal, Customs and Immigration Office	32.6	23.1	19.3	18.1	16.4	8.8	12.9	21.3	8.1	18.5	10.7	10.2	823	216	734	152
	20.6	11.2	24.3	19.1	19.3	24.7	20.0	22.5	8.4	15.7	7.4	6.8	1,116	89	1,480	88
	24.3	3.4	13.4	10.3	23.8	13.8	17.3	34.5	14.7	13.8	6.5	24.2	231	29	361	47
	21.8	23.4	15.2	17.1	16.3	12.7	21.9	20.5	12.5	11.2	12.3	15.1	1,587	205	790	118
	6.3	—	14.1	—	14.5	—	31.3	—	20.3	—	13.5	—	744	—	159	8
	13.0	8.4	17.7	17.7	13.6	12.4	28.4	28.0	13.6	19.6	13.7	13.9	3,230	6,547	2,113	4,949
Total Number	1,366	662	1,378	1,254	1,207	878	1,866	1,952	983	1,366	926	976	7,731	7,086	5,637	5,362
Per Cent Distribution	17.7	9.3	17.8	17.7	15.6	12.4	24.2	27.5	12.7	19.3	12.0	13.8				

**APPENDIX 3-4**  
**SELF-ASSESSMENT OF REASONS FOR POOR OR VERY POOR PROMOTION PROSPECTS,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Nature of Indicated Reasons	Occupational Group										Total Responding			
	Professional		Administration A, B and C		Technical and Inspection		Postal, Customs and Immigration		Office		Number		Per Cent	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total													
Inadequate Education and Experience	1.6	5.5	15.0	13.5	2.9	4.5	8.4	50.0	—	2.6	115	103	3.8	2.9
Poor Communication With My Supervisor	9.7	3.3	5.0	—	6.6	3.0	6.9	—	0.1	1.5	103	53	3.4	1.5
My Supervisor Underestimates the Importance of My Job	9.7	1.1	11.6	3.8	7.7	1.5	7.1	—	6.3	5.5	232	185	7.6	5.3
Very Few Opportunities Exist for Promotion From My Grade and/or Position	43.3	60.5	25.9	21.2	47.6	50.7	52.9	50.0	49.9	54.1	1,426	1,903	46.8	54.2
Regardless of Requirements, Men Are Preferred to Women of Equal Training and Ability	—	5.5	—	26.9	—	17.9	—	—	—	6.2	—	234	—	6.7
Regardless of Requirements, a Man Must be Clearly Superior to a Woman Before Being Selected for Promotion	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.7	—	41	—	1.3	—
Authority for Promotion Too Far Removed	5.9	2.2	5.4	3.8	11.5	3.0	2.3	—	6.0	5.5	196	188	6.4	5.4
Too Near Retirement Age	10.3	10.9	19.2	7.7	6.6	4.5	10.9	—	14.5	10.7	397	371	13.0	10.6
Other Reason	19.5	11.0	17.9	23.1	17.1	14.5	11.5	—	20.5	13.9	539	472	17.7	13.4
Total Responding	186	91	420	52	556	67	393	2	1,494	3,297	3,049	3,509	100.0	100.0

### APPENDIX 3-5

#### SELF-ASSESSMENT OF GRADE CAPABILITY, BY OCCUPATION AND SEX

Occupation	Self-Assessed Capability						Total Responding		View Not Stated	
	Present Grade		One Grade Higher		Two or More Grades Higher					
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total Responding									
Professional										
Physical and Bio-Sciences, Medical Officer and Specialist Medical Officer	39.8	46.9	45.0	38.8	15.2	14.3	689	49	7	6
Economics, Commerce, Finance, Social Worker and Junior Executive Officer	36.8	53.9	42.0	37.1	21.2	9.0	636	89	11	13
Librarian, Language Officer, Nurse and Dietitian	41.1	46.2	36.6	41.8	22.3	12.0	202	208	12	13
Administration A										
Foreign Service Officer, Civil Service Commission Officer, Administrative Officer and Defence Production Officer	25.1	26.3	44.3	47.4	30.6	26.3	2,531	171	65	6
Administration B and C										
Taxation Officer, Employment Officer and Editor	23.9	31.4	49.8	45.7	26.3	22.9	578	70	13	6
Technical and Inspection										
Technician and Draftsman	25.1	29.8	41.4	51.1	33.5	19.1	2,115	282	26	13
Computer Systems Programmer	48.5	78.6	45.1	21.4	6.4	—	235	28	—	—
Postal, Customs and Immigration										
Postal Officer, Letter Carrier, Postmaster, Customs Excise Officer and Immigration Officer	38.1	—	36.2	—	25.7	—	855	7	47	1
Office										
Clerks, Supervising Head Chief, Typist and Stenographer	16.0	27.7	54.8	55.7	29.2	16.6	4,794	10,197	124	483
Electronic Data Processor and Duplicating Equipment Operator	24.0	21.7	40.8	57.3	35.2	21.0	417	778	10	38
Total Number	3,200	3,333	6,144	6,531	3,708	2,015	13,052	11,879	316	569
Per Cent Distribution	24.5	28.0	47.1	55.0	28.4	17.0				

**APPENDIX 3-6**  
**EXPECTATIONS IN THE NEXT TEN YEARS**  
**BY OCCUPATION AND SEX**

Occupation	Present Grade		1-2 Grades Higher		3 Grades or More Higher		Total Responding		View Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total Responding									
Professional										
Physical and Bio-Sciences, Medical Officer and Specialist Medical Officer	6.8	14.3	66.2	57.1	27.0	28.6	690	49	7	6
Economics, Commerce, Finance, Social Worker and Junior Executive Officer	0.6	5.6	41.6	47.8	57.8	46.6	637	90	11	2
Librarian, Language Office, Nurse and Dietitian	15.6	20.7	40.0	57.7	44.4	21.6	205	208	8	13
Administration A										
Foreign Service Officer, Civil Service Commission Officer, Administrative Officer and Defence Production Officer	6.2	7.6	51.7	60.6	42.1	31.8	2,562	170	34	7
Administration B and C										
Taxation Officer, Employment Officer and Editor	4.9	15.5	59.8	59.1	35.3	25.4	572	71	19	4
Technical and Inspection										
Technician and Draftsman	7.2	7.5	49.3	51.2	43.5	41.3	2,115	281	26	14
Computer Systems Programmer	2.2	—	45.7	64.3	52.1	35.7	230	28	4	—
Postal, Customs and Immigration										
Postal Officer, Letter Carrier, Postmaster, Customs Excise Officer and Immigration Officer	29.0	—	45.5	—	25.5	—	880	8	23	—
Office										
Clerks, Supervising Head Chief, Typist and Stenographer	6.1	10.0	44.7	57.9	49.2	32.1	4,782	10,113	136	567
Electronic Data Processor and Duplicating Equipment Operator	10.5	2.9	39.7	62.1	49.8	35.0	418	780	9	37
Total Number	1,020	1,136	6,322	6,840	5,749	3,822	13,091	11,798	277	650
Per Cent	7.8	9.6	48.3	58.0	43.9	32.4				

# APPENDIX 3-7 PERFORMANCE OF MEN AND WOMEN IN SUPERVISORY AND NON-SUPERVISORY POSITIONS, BY SEX AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUP

Occupational Group and Sex		Non-supervisory Positions						Supervisory Positions					
		Per Cent of Total Responding			Number			Per Cent of Total Responding			Number		
		Men Better	Women Better	No Difference	No Opinion	Total	Not Stated	Men Better	Women Better	No Difference	No Opinion	Total	Not Stated
Professional	— Males	29.0	1.1	46.1	23.8	1,492	65	57.3	0.1	17.5	24.9	1,495	62
	Females	3.4	18.0	61.6	17.0	354	14	11.6	14.1	52.8	21.5	354	14
Administration A	— Males	45.6	1.7	35.0	17.7	2,520	76	71.2	—	12.0	16.8	2,521	75
	Females	6.5	11.2	67.6	14.7	170	7	18.6	8.7	57.6	15.1	172	5
Administration B and C	— Males	45.6	3.2	33.8	17.4	580	11	73.4	—	9.9	16.6	586	5
	Females	5.5	21.9	61.6	11.0	73	2	16.4	13.7	57.6	12.3	73	2
Technical and Inspection	— Males	50.4	1.4	34.1	14.1	2,324	52	68.2	1.0	13.9	16.9	2,325	50
	Females	9.0	14.0	62.3	14.7	321	2	37.6	4.2	38.7	19.5	313	10
Postal, Customs and Immigration	— Males	68.9	2.2	16.2	12.6	879	23	77.0	1.2	7.1	14.7	856	47
	Females	12.5	25.0	67.5	—	8	—	50.0	12.5	37.5	—	8	—
Office	— Males	35.6	3.5	44.2	16.6	5,168	178	67.0	2.8	19.1	11.1	5,205	141
	Females	10.1	26.7	45.0	18.2	11,218	279	35.4	15.8	30.2	18.6	11,082	415
Total	— Males	42.0	2.4	38.5	16.9	12,963	405	67.9	1.4	15.4	15.3	12,988	380
	Females	9.8	25.9	46.3	18.0	12,144	304	34.4	15.3	31.6	18.7	12,002	446



**APPENDIX 3-8**  
**PREFERENCES FOR MALE OR FEMALE SUPERVISOR RELATED TO EXPERIENCE OF WORKING UNDER A WOMAN SUPERVISOR, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group and Sex		Experience of Working Under a Woman Supervisor		Preferences for Male or Female Supervisor								Not Stated
				Man		Woman		No Difference				
		Yes	No	With Experience %	No Experience %	With Experience %	No Experience %	With Experience %	No Experience %			
Professional	— Males	320	1,226	65.0	74.5	0.6	0.1	34.4	25.4	11		
	Females	249	116	22.9	44.0	14.5	—	62.6	56.0	3		
Administration A, B and C	— Males	806	2,374	76.1	84.7	0.1	—	23.8	15.3	7		
	Females	187	64	33.7	32.8	4.3	1.6	62.0	65.6	1		
Technical and Inspection	— Males	574	1,796	78.7	83.7	2.1	—	19.2	16.3	6		
	Females	216	102	53.7	64.7	3.2	5.9	43.1	29.4	5		
Postal, Customs and Immigration	— Males	183	700	80.9	85.4	2.2	2.0	16.9	12.6	20		
	Females	3	5	66.7	80.0	33.3	—	—	40.0	0		
Office	— Males	3,002	2,259	64.8	81.6	3.5	0.1	31.7	18.3	84		
	Females	9,264	2,066	53.1	68.2	10.8	5.9	36.1	25.9	167		
Total	— Males	4,885	8,355	68.8	82.2	2.6	0.2	28.6	17.6	128		
	Females	9,919	2,353	52.0	65.9	10.7	5.4	37.3	28.7	176		

**APPENDIX 3-9**  
**PREFERENCES FOR MALE OR FEMALE ASSISTANT RELATED TO EXPERIENCE OF WORKING WITH WOMAN ASSISTANT,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group and Sex	Experience of Working With a Woman Assistant		Preference for Male or Female Assistant								Not Stated
			Man		Woman		No Difference				
			With Experience %	No Experience %	With Experience %	No Experience %	With Experience %	No Experience %			
Professional	—	Males	582	23.9	43.5	12.7	4.1	63.4	52.4	13	
		Females	216	3.2	9.1	30.6	28.7	66.2	62.2	9	
Administration A, B and C	—	Males	1,548	35.7	56.5	5.2	3.4	59.1	40.1	15	
		Females	184	67	4.5	25.0	28.4	72.3	67.1	1	
Technical and Inspection	—	Males	744	34.1	53.5	12.4	5.7	83.5	40.8	11	
		Females	163	145	20.0	29.4	17.2	55.3	62.8	15	
Postal, Customs and Immigration	—	Males	200	674	64.5	15.5	5.6	29.5	29.9	29	
		Females	4	3	33.3	—	33.3	100.0	33.3	1	
Office	—	Males	2,156	3,142	49.2	15.5	8.3	44.1	42.5	47	
		Females	5,188	5,810	15.7	39.1	39.4	49.7	44.9	499	
Total	—	Males	5,230	8,023	52.2	11.7	6.1	51.5	41.7	115	
		Females	5,755	6,168	15.5	38.0	38.5	51.3	46.0	525	

**APPENDIX 3-10**  
**PREFERENCE FOR MALE OR FEMALE CO-WORKER RELATED TO EXPERIENCE OF WORKING WITH WOMAN CO-WORKER,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group and Sex	Experience of Working With a Woman as Co-worker		Preferences for Male or Female as Co-worker								Not Stated
			Man		Woman		No Difference				
	Yes	No	With Experience %	No Experience %	With Experience %	No Experience %	With Experience %	No Experience %			
Professional	Males	726	817	36.5	52.4	1.7	1.0	61.8	46.6	14	
	Females	397	57	6.2	21.0	20.8	8.8	73.0	70.2	4	
Administration A, B and C	Males	1,816	1,358	43.1	64.4	1.0	1.2	55.9	34.4	14	
	Females	216	35	11.1	17.1	10.2	2.9	78.7	80.0	13	
Technical and Inspection	Males	1,352	1,011	47.6	63.1	4.4	2.6	48.0	34.3	13	
	Females	282	34	21.6	41.2	18.4	11.8	60.0	47.0	7	
Postal, Customs and Immigration	Males	428	446	57.5	74.9	7.2	2.0	35.3	23.1	29	
	Females	7	1	14.3	—	—	—	85.7	100.0	—	
Office	Males	4,509	714	43.6	68.3	7.4	7.6	49.0	24.1	122	
	Females	10,100	1,219	16.5	33.3	32.1	35.9	51.4	30.8	178	
Total	Males	8,831	4,346	44.2	63.6	5.2	2.6	50.6	33.8	191	
	Females	10,912	1,346	16.3	32.5	31.0	33.3	52.7	34.2	190	

**APPENDIX 4-1**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CASUAL SICK LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	None		1-2		3-4		5-7		Total Responding		Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total Responding								No.	No.	No.	No.
Professional	32.5	14.7	32.4	32.9	21.4	26.2	13.7	26.2	1,501	347	56	21
Administration A	37.2	21.8	32.1	30.0	19.3	24.7	11.4	23.5	2,521	174	75	3
Administration B and C	26.8	17.1	25.6	27.1	25.2	27.1	22.4	28.7	566	70	25	6
Technical and Inspection	23.3	12.3	22.1	24.3	23.0	25.6	31.6	37.8	2,317	309	59	14
Postal, Customs and Immigration	23.7	—	29.9	—	21.1	—	25.3	—	864	8	39	—
Office	17.6	13.2	17.6	18.7	30.5	28.0	31.6	40.1	5,249	10,999	96	497
Total Number	3,242	1,596	3,144	2,320	3,265	3,309	3,367	4,682	13,018	11,907	350	541
Per Cent	24.9	13.4	24.2	19.5	25.1	27.8	25.8	39.3	100.0	100.0		

**APPENDIX 4-2**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CASUAL SICK LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX**

Marital Status	None		1-2		3-4		5-7		Total Responding		Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Per Cent of Total Responding								No.	No.	No.	No.
Single	27.2	21.6	19.3	20.7	26.3	25.7	27.2	32.0	3,277	4,950	79	203
Married	33.0	7.3	34.0	20.3	32.5	28.3	33.5	44.1	9,068	5,114	230	264
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	17.4	6.4	37.5	14.4	12.6	32.0	32.5	47.2	293	1,754	—	73
Marital Status Not Stated	13.4	44.4	21.5	4.4	39.4	34.4	25.7	16.8	380	90	41	1
Total Number	3,242	1,596	3,144	2,320	3,265	3,309	3,367	4,682	13,018	11,907	350	541

**APPENDIX 4-3**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CASUAL SICK LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY AGE GROUP AND SEX**

Age Group	None		1-2		3-4		5-7		Total Responding		Absences Not Stated	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	Per Cent of Total Responding								No.	No.	No.	No.
Under 20 years	42.2	24.2	21.8	14.9	31.0	34.1	5.0	26.8	436	900	—	28
20-24	27.8	15.2	18.1	14.4	18.0	24.5	36.1	45.9	1,734	2,056	6	68
25-29	13.0	15.8	19.3	11.3	33.6	30.4	34.1	42.5	1,916	1,025	15	3
30-34	13.8	13.4	24.8	15.6	30.4	28.1	31.0	42.9	1,462	782	30	31
35-39	26.4	17.3	33.8	23.0	19.4	32.9	20.4	26.8	1,224	821	18	66
40-44	27.2	6.4	22.0	30.1	26.6	16.4	24.2	47.1	1,564	1,356	111	46
45-54	29.3	10.0	27.2	21.8	23.5	31.3	20.0	36.9	3,179	2,990	124	200
55-64	29.4	12.5	26.1	20.9	21.1	28.0	23.4	38.6	1,471	1,910	43	97
65 years and over	23.3	5.7	3.3	8.6	60.0	2.9	13.4	82.8	30	35	1	1
Total Number	3,239	1,566	3,145	2,319	3,265	3,308	3,367	4,682	13,016	11,875	348	540
Age Not Stated	4	31	—	1	—	1	—	1	4	33		



**APPENDIX 4-4**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND SEX**

Occupational Group	None		1-2		3-4		5-7		8 or More		Total Responding		Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Per Cent of Total Responding														
Professional	78.4	57.8	2.9	5.3	5.8	11.3	4.2	10.3	8.7	15.3	1,350	301	207	67
Administration A	73.8	56.8	4.8	3.7	7.3	13.0	6.3	11.1	7.8	15.4	2,270	162	326	15
Administration B and C	66.6	41.3	3.1	1.6	9.8	9.5	7.9	22.2	12.6	25.4	518	63	73	13
Technical and Inspection	59.2	45.9	7.0	5.8	10.4	13.3	9.3	14.8	14.1	20.2	2,073	292	303	31
Postal, Customs and Immigration	45.9	—	8.1	—	11.9	—	16.8	—	17.3	—	808	7	95	—
Office	53.8	46.6	6.5	5.3	13.9	12.8	8.9	13.8	16.9	21.5	4,814	10,607	531	890
Total Number	7,266	5,368	687	603	1,275	1,464	998	1,567	1,607	2,430	11,833	11,432	1,535	1,016
Per Cent Distribution	61.4	47.0	5.8	5.3	10.8	12.8	8.4	13.7	13.6	21.2	100.0	100.0		

**APPENDIX 4-5**  
**NUMBER OF DAYS ON CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966,**  
**BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX**

Marital Status	None		1-2		3-4		5-7		8 or More		Total Responding		Absences Not Stated		
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Per Cent of Total Responding															
Single	69.3	58.7	3.6	4.2	10.0	11.4	7.3	6.9	9.8	18.8	3,082	4,624	274	529	
Married	60.0	38.6	6.5	5.8	10.5	14.5	9.0	19.6	14.0	21.5	8,115	5,029	1,183	348	
Widowed, Separated or Divorced	48.7	39.6	18.0	7.0	3.1	10.6	8.3	15.2	21.9	27.6	228	1,690	64	137	
Marital Status Not Stated	37.5	46.1	2.5	1.1	24.8	32.6	6.6	4.5	28.6	15.7	408	89	14	2	
Total Number	7,266	5,368	687	603	1,275	1,464	998	1,567	1,607	2,430	11,833	11,432	1,535	1,016	

# APPENDIX 4-6 NUMBER OF DAYS ON CERTIFIED SICK LEAVE IN 1966, BY AGE GROUP AND SEX

Age Group	None		1-2		3-4		5-7		8 or More		Total Responding		Absences Not Stated	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Per Cent of Total Responding														
Under 20	97.6	53.8	—	9.8	—	15.4	1.2	13.1	1.2	7.9	431	773	5	155
20-24	62.8	52.9	3.1	9.5	16.5	13.4	10.1	12.2	7.5	12.0	1,531	1,978	209	146
25-29	54.7	45.9	8.4	6.6	6.2	10.9	15.8	12.2	14.9	24.4	1,720	1,012	211	16
30-34	57.9	44.1	9.7	1.0	14.5	12.5	4.9	21.5	13.0	20.9	1,378	775	114	38
35-39	62.8	45.7	4.6	4.4	12.5	12.8	7.3	12.4	20.8	26.7	1,052	787	190	100
40-44	58.5	45.1	6.5	3.6	8.3	12.3	5.9	17.5	20.8	21.5	1,502	1,199	173	202
45-54	64.3	48.9	4.7	4.1	12.7	10.0	7.8	15.1	10.5	21.9	2,795	2,967	509	222
55-64	56.1	37.8	6.2	3.4	7.4	17.7	8.3	10.5	22.0	30.6	1,389	1,874	125	133
65 and over	80.0	11.8	—	—	—	2.9	6.7	—	13.3	85.3	30	34	1	2
Total Number	7,262	5,334	687	603	1,274	1,464	998	1,568	1,607	2,430	11,828	11,399	1,537	1,025
Age Not Stated	4	34	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	34	—	—

## APPENDIX 4-7 SEPARATIONS, CIVIL SERVICE OF CANADA, BY REASON AND SEX, CALENDAR YEARS 1962 to 1965

Reason	1962				1963				1964				1965			
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Death	508	5.3	83	1.3	485	6.2	72	1.3	503	6.6	75	1.3	496	5.9	95	1.5
End of specified period	1,629	17.1	868	13.2	865	11.0	226	4.2	77	1.0	39	0.7	63	0.7	69	1.1
Dismissal	223	2.3	61	0.9	205	2.6	25	0.5	148	2.0	12	0.2	130	1.5	10	0.2
Removal (other than ill health or age)	—	—	—	—	34	0.4	7	0.1	9	0.1	2	—	15	0.2	4	0.1
Rejection during probation	240	2.5	63	0.9	259	3.3	72	1.4	224	3.0	76	1.3	319	3.8	102	1.7
Laid off	98	1.0	62	0.9	48	0.6	10	0.2	293	3.9	122	2.2	126	1.5	47	0.8
Voluntary retirement (60 years or older)	—	—	—	—	722	9.2	195	3.7	1,103	14.6	366	6.5	1,003	11.9	447	7.3
Involuntary retirement (60 years or older)	1,540	16.2	377	5.7	869	11.1	211	4.0	492	6.5	125	2.2	680	8.1	169	2.7
III health (voluntary retirement — under 60 years)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
III health (involuntary retirement — under 60 years)	501	5.3	412	6.3	376	4.8	315	5.9	260	3.4	233	4.2	260	3.1	220	3.6
Marriage	—	—	386	5.9	—	—	343	6.4	67	0.9	37	0.7	75	0.9	41	0.7
Maternity	—	—	365	5.6	—	—	336	6.3	—	—	326	5.8	—	—	289	4.7
Full-time home responsibilities	—	—	—	—	—	—	488	9.1	—	—	824	14.7	—	—	312	5.1
Full-time educational studies	1,002	10.5	219	3.3	693	8.8	200	3.7	325	4.3	165	3.0	402	4.8	181	2.9
Moved to another locality	351	3.7	973	14.8	200	2.5	941	17.6	261	3.5	974	17.4	334	4.0	1,074	17.5
To accept other employment	1,834	19.2	702	10.7	1,700	21.6	600	11.2	2,232	29.5	724	12.9	2,382	28.3	804	13.1
Other	1,609	16.9	2,008	30.5	1,407	17.9	1,306	24.4	1,562	20.7	1,161	20.7	2,128	25.3	1,420	23.2
Total	9,535	100.0	6,579	100.0	7,863	100.0	5,347	100.0	7,556	100.0	5,606	100.0	8,413	100.0	6,133	100.0

Source: Pay Research Bureau, Civil Service Commission.

# APPENDIX 4-8

## TURNOVER RATES OF SELECTED OCCUPATIONS, BY SEX, EMPLOYEES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, 1965

Occupation	Number as of September 30, 1965		Separations			
			Males		Females	
	Males	Females	Number	Turnover Rate	Number	Turnover Rate
Professionals	6,607	547	540	8.2	93	17.1
Clerk	9,704	14,972	940	9.8	1,774	11.9
Stenographer	122	7,208	11	9.1	1,217	16.9
Typist	156	4,973	21	13.5	1,184	23.9
Nurse	32	1,588	3	9.4	460	29.0
Bookkeeping, Calculating, Duplicating Equipment Operator and Electronic Data Processor	568	1,272	47	8.3	173	13.7
Postal Clerk	8,641	567	659	7.7	77	13.6
Technical Officer	3,700	204	205	5.6	14	6.9
Administrative Officer	2,225	165	84	3.8	13	7.9
Assessor	1,356	9	149	11.0	—	—
Cleaning Service	4,853	53	730	15.1	9	17.0
Stationary Engineer, Heating or Power	1,970	2	210	10.7	2	—
Customs Excise Officer	3,248	136	103	3.2	9	6.7
Immigration Officer	781	10	34	4.4	1	—
Total, Selected Occupations	43,963	31,706	3,742	8.6	5,026	15.9

Source: Pay Research Bureau, Civil Service Commission.

**APPENDIX 4-9**  
**TURNOVER RATES OF PROFESSIONAL OCCUPATIONS, BY SEX,**  
**EMPLOYEES UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, 1965**

Occupation	Number as of September 30, 1965		Separations			
			Males		Females	
	Males	Females	Number	Turnover Rate	Number	Turnover Rate
Engineer	1,382	3	122	8.9	—	—
Architect	107	2	14	13.1	—	—
Chemist	192	35	18	9.4	9	25.8
Patent Examiner	154	1	19	12.4	—	—
Scientific and Senior Scientific Officer, M.T.S.	433	15	21	4.9	1	—
Bacteriologist	50	15	6	12.0	1	—
Veterinarian	464	2	39	8.5	—	—
Dental Officer	63	1	10	15.9	1	—
Pharmacist	47	6	7	14.9	1	—
Medical Officer and Specialist	406	22	25	6.2	7	31.9
Dietitian, Nutritionist, Home Economist	2	107	—	—	31	29.0
Economist and Statistician	442	61	42	9.6	7	8.2
Librarian	44	87	6	13.7	12	13.8
Archivist	29	4	4	13.8	1	—
Social Worker	24	50	3	12.5	9	18.0
Solicitor and Counsel, Taxation Professor, Lecturer, Associate and Assistant Professor	182	4	14	7.7	2	—
Meteorologist and Meteorological Officer	160	—	33	20.7	—	—
Research Director and Officer, Agriculture and Forestry	487	—	29	6.0	—	—
Food and Drug Officer	1,187	28	76	6.5	1	—
Junior Executive Officer	162	2	10	6.2	—	—
Others	119	42	12	10.1	9	21.5
	471	60	30	6.4	1	—
Total	6,607	547	540	8.2	93	17.1

Source: Pay Research Bureau, Civil Service Commission.

## APPENDIX 5-1

### NUMBER OF COMMENTS BY FEMALE EMPLOYEES ON SOME ASPECTS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE, BY NATURE OF PROBLEM AND MARITAL STATUS

Nature of Problem	Marital Status			Total Number of Women Commenting
	Single	Married	Widowed, Separated or Divorced	
Community Child Care	46	122	35	203
Promotional Opportunities	90	50	41	181
On-the-job Health Care Provisions	29	15	35	79
Superannuation Policies	23	35	15	73
Maternity Leave Practices	14	36	3	53
Miscellaneous Comments				
(a) Part-time Employment	15	41	4	60
(b) Training Opportunities	23	27	17	67

Note: Number of respondents was 257 single women, 243 married and 82 widowed, separated or divorced, making a total of 582 women or 30 per cent of respondents. There were 105 additional comments which have omitted because they were either trivial or irrelevant.



## APPENDIX 5-2

Age Group, Sex and Marital Status

<sup>1</sup>Others includes widowed, separated or divorced.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- ANDERSON, C. ARNOLD, and MARY JEAN BOWMAN, *Education and Economic Development*, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1965.
- COLE, ROBERT TAYLOR, *The Canadian Bureaucracy — A Study of Canadian Civil Servants and Other Public Employees, 1939-1947*, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C.
- DAWSON, ROBERT MacGREGOR, *The Civil Service of Canada*, Oxford University Press, London, 1929.
- JUDEK, STANISLAW, *Medical Manpower in Canada*, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1964.
- McCRENSKY, EDWARD, *Scientific Manpower in Europe*, Pergamon Press, Inc., New York, 1958.
- MEAD, MARGARET D., *Male and Female*, W. Morrow, New York, 1949.
- MYRDAL, ALVA, and VIOLA KLEIN, *Women's Two Roles — Home and Work*, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1956.
- NATIONAL MANPOWER COUNCIL, *Womanpower*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1957.
- WILSON, GEORGE W., SCOTT GORDON, and STANISLAW JUDEK, *Canada: An Appraisal of its Needs and Resources*. The Twentieth Century Fund, New York, and University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1965.
- ZWEIG, FERDINAND, *Women's Life and Labour*, Victor Gollancz, London, 1952.

### REPORTS AND PAMPHLETS

- CANADA DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR, WOMEN'S BUREAU, "The Employment of Women with Family Responsibility," 1965 (mimeographed).
- "Maternity Protection for Women Workers in Canada," 1966.
- "Women at Work in Canada," Queen's Printer, 1965.
- "Facts and Figures about Women in the Labour Force," 1965.
- CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF CANADA, First Annual Report, Sessional Paper No. 31, King's Printer, 1910.
- Forty-Seventh Annual Report, Queen's Printer, 1955.
- DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS, 1961 Census of Canada, Bulletin 3.1-9.
- INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, "The Recommendations Concerning Employment of Women with Family Responsibilities," 49th Session, Conference, June 2, 1965.
- OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY, Superannuation Branch, "Your Superannuation Plan," Ottawa, 1964.
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION, Vol. I, "Management of the Public Service," Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1962.
- UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, "Preamble to the Draft Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women," 19th Session, Geneva, March 1966.
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WOMEN'S BUREAU, "Women in Higher-Level Positions," 1950.
- U.S. PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, Report of the Committee on Federal Employment, U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1963.
- Report of the Committee on Private Employment, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- Report of the Committee on Protective Labour Legislation, U.S. Government Printing Office 1963.

#### ARTICLES

- BRUNTZ, FRANCOIS, "The Part-time Employment of Women in Industrial Countries," *International Labour Review*, I.L.O., November 1962, pp. 425-442.
- CANADA DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR, WOMEN'S BUREAU, "Socio-Medical Problems of Working Women," *The Labour Gazette*, Vol. LXIV, No. 3.
- HARRISON, EVELYN, "The Quiet Revolution," *Civil Service Journal*, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Vol. 3, No. 2, October-December 1962, pp. 5-7, and 22-24.
- ROYCE, MARION, "The Women's Bureau", *Canadian Labour*, June 1965, p. 5
- PETERSON, ESTHER, "The Status of Women in the United States," *International Labour Review*, I.L.O., May 1964, pp. 447-460.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

- Proceedings of Select Special Committee of the House of Commons on Civil Service and Civil Service Act, 1932, Queen's Printer.
- Canadian Sessional Papers, 1869, subsec. 19.
- Canadian Sessional Papers, 1880-81, subsec. 113.















